

Solicitors' Journal & Reporter.

LONDON, JULY 20, 1878.

CONTENTS.

JOURNAL.

CURRENT TOPICS:—	
The Committee on Land Titles and Transfer	737
The Innkeepers' Bill	737
The Scottish Court of Session	737
Change of Solicitor	737
Crime Committed during Soudanbulam	738
English Law in Japan	738
The County Courts Committee	738
LEADERS:—	
The Effect of the Word "Vest" in Statutes Vesting Property in Local Authorities	738
The Report of the Legal Offices Committee	739
The New Criminal Code	740
REVIEWS:—	
CASES OF THE WEEK	742
Legal Offices Committee	744
SOCIETIES	747
LEGAL NEWS	748
APPOINTMENTS, ETC.	748
HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE	749
COUNTY COURTS	749
LEGISLATION OF THE WEEK	750
LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL	750
CHIEF PAPERS	751
LONDON GAZETTES, &c., &c.	751

NOTES OF CASES.

Burkshaw v. Nicholls	742
Ex parte Cullley	742
The Attorney-General v. The Swansea Tramways Company	743
Amos v. Chadwick	743
In re Salvage Steamship Company (Limited)	743
Re Birkett	743

REPORTS.

Bradshaw, Ex parte (Q.B.Div.)	758
Brown, In re Thomas (Q.B.Div.)	757
Gannon v. Villars (Ch.Div. M.R.)	751
Edmunds, Appellant; Savin, Respondent (Q.B.Div.)	755
Mayer v. Farmer (Ex. Div.)	760
Renaix v. Cowlishaw (Ch.Div. V.C.H.)	754
Samuel v. Samuel (Ch.Div. M.R.)	750
Schuster and another v. Fletcher (Q.B.Div.)	756
Tilley v. Truster (Prob. Div.)	760
Torrens v. Millington (Ch.Div. V.C.B.)	753
Watts v. Barnett (App.)	745
Welf v. Barnett and others (App.)	746
Yates and another v. Foster (App.)	745

CURRENT TOPICS.

AS WE ANTICIPATED last week, the select committee of the House of Commons on the Land Titles and Transfer Question have terminated their sittings for the present session, and have reported the evidence taken before them to the House, with a recommendation that the committee be re-appointed next session. We understand that the whole of the evidence, which is somewhat voluminous and embraces the examination of seventeen witnesses, will be published in the course of a fortnight or three weeks.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR, to whose vigilant supervision of legislation the public are greatly indebted, has framed, and procured the insertion in the Innkeepers' Bill, of amendments confining the operation of the measure in the manner we ventured to suggest last week. It is now provided "that the debt for the payment of which a sale is made shall not be any other or greater debt than the debt for which the goods or other articles could have been retained by the innkeeper under his lien."

THE LEARNED JUDGES of the Court of Session in Scotland, or some of them, are in a state as nearly approaching mutiny as is possible for grave and reverend administrators of the law. A few days ago, in the

second division of the court, the Lord Justice-Clerk complained that the division was prevented from taking the proofs before it with due expedition owing to the fact that the court was without its full statutory number of judges. "He could not," he said, "understand why the Act of Parliament had been violated so long." And a day or two afterwards Lord Craighill, after hearing the examination of one witness, half-past one o'clock having arrived, said that was the ordinary hour of adjournment for lunch, and, in ordinary circumstances, he should have adjourned for the time for which he had been in the habit of adjourning for lunch during a proof. He had, however, to intimate that he would not on that occasion, or on any other occasion, until the place rendered vacant by the death of the depute-clerk was filled up, go on with business after that hour. Seven weeks ago Mr. Drysdale, who had long filled the office of depute-clerk, died, and from that time there had been no one appointed to perform the duties which he had discharged. The consequence of that was that in the afternoon, from half-past one o'clock, the court had been left without any clerk to do the work incumbent on the clerk. He had intimated his intention to the Lord President, and he now announced that until a clerk should be appointed "there would be no business done by him after that hour." "Nothing," he added, "more inconsistent with his wishes could possibly have occurred than the necessity by which he felt he was now influenced." We cannot doubt that the learned judge will see the propriety of crowning this act of devoted self-denial by refunding a proportionate part of his salary. We do not pretend to understand Scottish judicial arrangements or feelings; but here in England we usually consider that a judge should do what he is paid to do, even though he may be very angry with the Government. That insignificant creature the suitor is likely to feel the learned judge's refusal to reappear after lunch considerably more than either the Lord Advocate or the Government.

THE CASE of *Grant v. Holland* (reported in last week's issue of the WEEKLY REPORTER, p. 742) affords another illustration of the far-reaching scope of sub-section 11 of section 25 of the Judicature Act, 1873. In *Witt v. Ames* (11 W. R. 751) the Court of Queen's Bench laid it down as the invariable practice at common law not to permit the attorney on the record to be changed unless his costs were paid. The rule, however, has not prevailed in equity, and consolidated ord. 3, r. 3, simply provides that a party is not to change his solicitor except by order on motion or petition of course. Here, therefore, is a case in which there is a conflict or variance between the rules of equity and the rules of common law with reference to the same matter; and if there were nothing more in the Act there could be no doubt that the rule of equity must prevail. But section 87 of the Judicature Act, 1873, provides that solicitors shall, "as far as circumstances will permit, be entitled, as such solicitors, to the same privileges, and be subject to the same obligations as if this Act had not passed." Mr. Baron Huddleston explained the meaning of this provision as being only that "the privileges of solicitors as to freedom from serving in certain offices and the right to sue in their own courts shall be secured to them"—a very narrow interpretation. And Mr. Justice Lindley said that "section 87 is meant to secure to solicitors as a body the privileges which they formerly enjoyed. This, however, is not a matter applicable to the general body, but one which merely affects the right of the solicitor in the individual case." We are unable to appreciate the distinction drawn by the latter learned judge. The right not to be discharged from the conduct of an action without payment of costs may be said to be a matter as applicable to the general body of solicitors as the right to conduct the action.

ACCORDING TO THE DAILY PAPERS, a prisoner was recently convicted at Edinburgh of having, while in a state of somnambulism, murdered his child, and has since been set at liberty. Cases of this kind are very rare, but, assuming the somnambulism to be clearly proved, there can be little question of the correctness of the course thus adopted. Dornblüth, the German psychologist, tells of a young woman who, in consequence of a fright occasioned by an attack of robbers, was seized with epilepsy, and became subject to somnambulism. While in that condition she was in the habit of stealing articles, and was charged with theft, but on the advice of Dornblüth was released and eventually cured. Steltzer (cited in Wharton and Stillé) gives an account of a somnambulist who clambered out of a garret window, descended into the next house, and killed a young girl who was asleep there. And the same learned writers quote from Sarvarin an account of a somnambulist monk (related to Savarin by the prior of the convent where the incident happened):—"The somnambulist entered the chamber of the prior, his eyes were open but fixed, the light of two lamps made no impression upon him, his features were contracted, and he carried in his hand a large knife. Going straight to the bed, he had first the appearance of examining if the prior was there. He then struck three blows, which pierced the coverings, and even a mat which served the purpose of a mattress. In returning, his countenance was unbent, and was marked by an air of satisfaction. The next day the prior asked the somnambulist what he had dreamed of the preceding night, and the latter answered that he had dreamed that his mother had been killed by the prior, and that her ghost had appeared to him demanding vengeance; that at this sight he was so transported by rage that he had immediately run to stab the assassin of his mother." Savarin adds that if the prior had been killed the monk could not possibly, under these circumstances, have been punished.

THE APPOINTMENT of an English barrister, Mr. C. J. Tarring, as Professor of English Law, including International Law and Jurisprudence, in the University of Tokio, Japan, deserves notice as a sign of Japanese progress. While our Inns of Court are holding out large encouragement to their students to spend their time over an ancient system of law, some of the most characteristic doctrines of which have been discarded even by the nations whose laws have been mainly founded upon it, the Japanese seem to be taking our law as their instrument of legal training. We understand that Mr. Tarring will lecture in English, that being now adopted as the learned language at the University of Tokio.

IT IS ANNOUNCED that the County Courts Bills Committee have reported Mr. Norwoods Bill with amendments, and have recommended that the costs of the summons or plaint note should be reduced; that registrars entrusted with judicial functions should not be allowed to practise, and that the salary of the judges should be raised to £2,000. If this is true, we hope the county court judges will be pleased, but their delight may be a little premature, for the Treasury has still to be fought, and the Treasury in these days is very potent in legal matters.

The Association for the Reform and Codification of the Law of Nations will open its sixth annual conference at Frankfort-on-the-Maine on the 20th of August. The Lord Chief Baron is now the president, and hopes are entertained that he may preside. Sir R. J. Phillimore has likewise joined the association, which proposes finally to deal at Frankfort with the question of bills of exchange.

THE EFFECT OF THE WORD "VEST" IN STATUTES VESTING PROPERTY IN LOCAL AUTHORITIES.

THE CASE of *Coverdale v. Charlton* (26 W. R. 687, 3 Q. B. D. 376), is a decision of some importance with regard to the effect of words not unfrequently met with in Acts of Parliament. The Public Health Act, 1875, s. 149, enacts that all streets, being highways repairable by the inhabitants at large, within any urban district, and the pavements, stones, and other materials thereof shall vest in and be under the control of the urban authority. By the 4th section the term "street" includes any highway not being a turnpike road, and any road, lane, &c. The local board of a district had let the pasturage of the strips of grass which formed the sides of a certain lane within such district, being a highway repairable by the inhabitants at large, to the plaintiff. The defendant, without any right to do so, turned his cattle on to these strips of land to graze. The plaintiff brought an action against the defendant for so doing, and the latter denied the plaintiff's right to the pasturage. The court held that the lane, being a street within the interpretation section of the Public Health Act, 1875, vested in the local board under the provisions of section 149, and that the "vesting" intended by that section was not merely of the use and control of the lane so far as might be necessary for highway purposes, but an actual vesting of the property in the lane; and, consequently, that the lease from the local board entitled the plaintiff to maintain the action.

Similar provisions to that of the Public Health Act vesting the streets in the urban authority are not unfrequently met with in regard to other descriptions of property which are vested for public purposes in corporations, commissioners, or trustees, by Act of Parliament; and previously to the above decision there appears to have been an absence of authority as to the effect of the word "vest" in such cases. Some question may arise hereafter as to the effect of the decision above referred to. It will be observed that the opposing contentions which were brought to the attention of the court were, on the one hand, that the local board only had, by virtue of the statute, a power of use and control over the lane for highway purposes analogous to an easement, the soil remaining in the previous owner; and, on the other hand, that an actual estate in the soil was vested in them. But no discussion took place as to the extent of the estate in the soil that was to be considered vested in the board. Cockburn, C.J., says, in giving judgment, "It is suggested by the defendant that it is not meant that the ownership of the soil shall vest, but simply such rights over the surface as are necessarily incidental to the use of the highway. This appears to me too narrow a construction. It may be that it is a great hardship on the person in whom the soil of the highway was vested before the local board was formed that the soil should be divested out of him by the statute and vested in the local board; but if the Legislature has chosen so to enact they are omnipotent. The soil of the road being vested in the local board, it follows that they have a right in law to dispose of it and to let the herbage to the plaintiff as they have done." Mellor, J., says, "The defendant's counsel failed, I think, to show that the Act uses the word 'vested' in the limited sense he suggests. He argued that the roads vested in the local board only for certain limited purposes connected with the use and management of the highway. But the language seems to me to go further, and to vest the property in the soil in the local board."

Now the property in the soil of any area of land, by the general doctrine of law, involves a right of property in the subjacent strata, and a question might arise in future as to the property in the strata below a street. This, if there were minerals below, might be a question of importance. The line of the road might cut through a vein of coal or mineral ore. But we do not think that

the court can have meant in any way to express an opinion on this question. The point was not before them, it not being really involved in the contention for the plaintiff. The Act says that the street shall vest, and the decision is merely that the soil of the street vests. Now, a street is not a vertical section or slice of the earth; it is a riband of surface. The ordinary rule of law depends on the principle that in the absence of any title or reason why the property in the subjacent strata should be in anyone else, it is most reasonable to hold that it should belong to the owner of the surface. But there seems no reason why the local board should have more than that thickness of soil which may be fairly held to be included in the word "street," and it would certainly seem most unreasonable that for highway purposes coal or other mineral which might be at a depth far below the street should be vested in the local board.

THE REPORT OF THE LEGAL OFFICES COMMITTEE.

II.

We summarized last week the conclusions of the committee; we have now to see how far they are borne out by the evidence.

Upon the first question submitted to the committee, "whether an office for the issue of writs of all kinds can be constituted for the High Court of Justice, into which the existing writ offices may be merged, and also whether the appearance offices, which now form separate departments in some of the common law divisions, may be merged with the writ office, thus forming a consolidated writ and appearance office for the High Court?", there was little difference of opinion, and, indeed, since the changes effected by the Judicature Acts in the way of diminishing the technical and peculiar duties of the departments, hardly any doubt could be entertained as to the possibility of amalgamating the offices in the manner proposed. The officials of the Record and Writ Office (Mr. Romilly and Mr. Bedwell) admitted that they saw no difficulty in the union of their offices with the similar offices in the common law divisions. Mr. Romilly gave it as his opinion that in one branch of his office there were rather more clerks than were wanted; but neither Mr. Romilly nor Mr. Bedwell could be quite brought to see the advantage, so earnestly and plausibly set forth by the learned and eminent chairman, of summoning clerks from one department to assist in another. We imagine the truth is, that to satisfy practitioners, the Record and Writ Department must always be rather overmanned. The attendance of the profession must always be irregular, and a staff which seems to have little to do one day may be run off its feet the next. It is not easy to see how sudden and temporary pressure of work, such as arises in this office, could be conveniently met by calling in more clerks from other departments; it is easy to see that some confusion and difficulty might be the result. As to the possibility of the union of the offices of the three common law divisions hardly any question could be raised. It will be remembered that the Legal Departments Commissioners reported, four years ago, that they saw no reason whatever why all process of every kind should not issue out of one department—at least for the common law divisions—and they advised the merger of the existing distinctive staffs and duties. Two of the masters examined before the committee took the same view; but Sir F. Pollock seems to have doubted whether any advantage would result from the union, on this rather curious ground: "I think the present division is a convenient one for purposes of reference and distinction. It is very much as if you had a library, and if you put all your books in one bookcase, or if you classified them in three bookcases." But to make the comparison applicable, all, or nearly all, the books must be on the same subject, and in that case one does not see the advantage

of classification. Both Mr. Hodgson and Mr. Gordon were clearly of opinion that, given the buildings of the new law courts, there would be no difficulty in uniting what we may term the general offices of all the common law divisions.

As to the Crown Office the committee came to a different conclusion from the Legal Departments Commissioners. The latter were of opinion, while fully recognizing the necessity for the machinery of the Crown Office, and the special technical character of the work done in the office, that there was no reason why the masters on both sides of the court should not be on a common list, draw an equal salary, and discharge concurrent duties, and that the staff in the Crown Office might be welded into that of the Masters' Department generally. The committee think that the technical nature of the practice renders it impossible there should be for the present a fusion of the Crown Office with the other departments of the central office, and they are unable to recommend that the staff of this office should be interchangeable with the general staff of the central office to the same extent as in the other departments with which they have dealt; and they accordingly advise that the office should form a separate department, at all events until the practice has been so simplified as to render it unnecessary to assign special officers to the department. We have urged the necessity of this simplification, and hope the day referred to by the committee is not far distant. At present, according to the evidence of Mr. J. R. Mellor, Q.C., it takes a man of legal education and training two years to learn the practice of the Crown Office; and, Mr. Cockburn relates the painful fact that two masters of the Crown Office, who were appointed direct from the bar, were in the office for many years after they were appointed before they learned the practice.

The registrars' office of the Probate Division constituted another difficulty. According to the evidence of the senior registrar the four registrars have specific duties arranged for each day:—"We have one in attendance on the judge at Westminster, and three in attendance at the probate registry, and each has his duty assigned to him for the day. One is in communication with the district registrars in the country, conducting correspondence with them, and another attending to the London business, or to applications made in London; and the other is attending to matters which are referred to the registrars by the court, to allotments of alimony, and to taxation of costs." The suggestion of the committee that the registrars should assume the name and position of masters, but that, considering the special nature of the practice as to probate business, the four present probate registrars should, in the first instance, be specially assigned to this branch of business, but although attending primarily thereto they should, if required, be liable to perform the other duties of a master of the Supreme Court, means, of course, the establishment of a separate probate department, the non-contentious business of which would be conducted, as at present, at Somerset House.

As regards the recommendation of the committee that the duty of attending a divisional court in the Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer Divisions, except as regards Crown business, may be dispensed with, little evidence seems to have been taken, but the recommendation accords with some of the evidence given before the Legal Departments Commission. That commission reported that "the evidence of the masters themselves goes to show that, in their opinion, it is necessary there should be attendance by the master in court, but that it is not necessary to have more than one master and one clerk in each court. Some solicitors concur in this, but many think that a good clerk is all that is needed. Master Hodgson, of the Queen's Bench, whilst giving his opinion in favour of a master's attendance, said, 'Looking forward to what seems to be rather in the far distance, when the new courts are built and we have our offices in immediate proximity to the court,

the aspect of things may be much altered. I think the master might not then be required to sit so constantly in court as he does now, as he might be summoned into court, perhaps, in two minutes, but now there is a very great difference, when the courts and offices are so far apart." Mr. Hollams said he saw no need for regular attendance of the master in court; that even now at Westminster he could be sent for if wanted."

One of the questions propounded to the committee was: "What arrangements should be made for the future transaction of the administrative business at the assizes? Should there be clerks of assize and subordinate officers, as now, with duties which do not occupy more than a third of the year, or would it be practicable to carry out the suggestions of the Legal Departments Commission on this subject?" These suggestions, put briefly, were that, in view of the short time in the year, not more than three months, during which the clerk of assize is called upon to exercise his functions, he should be an officer attached to the Crown Office, or to the master's department of the High Court of Justice, and do duty there at such times as he is not employed on circuit; and that the officers under the clerk of assize should also form part of an organized staff, employed continuously except in holiday time, instead of being, as now, for the most part on detached service. The opinion of the committee that "the present system, as regards the principal officers of the circuits, is as efficient and economical as any that could be suggested," seems to go a little beyond what even Mr. Avory said in answer to the chairman's question, "You think the present system is about as good as we can have?"—"I do not say that the present system is the best that can be; but I cannot devise a better, without the danger of producing confusion and imperfection in the performance of the duties on circuit." The committee, however, suggest that "in the intervals between the circuits such members of the circuit staffs as would consent to act should render assistance in the Associates' Department, when necessary, on such special terms as might be from time to time arranged." This probably means that no change will be made.

We leave to next week the consideration of the evidence as to judges' chambers.

THE NEW CRIMINAL CODE.

IV.

THE specific provisions as to the offences of murder and manslaughter are preceded by some general enactments (in chapter 19) as "to homicide," which is defined (by section 131) as "the killing of a human being by a human being." The same section lays down the earliest period of life at which a child can be the subject of homicide: "A child becomes a human being within the meaning of this definition when it has completely proceeded in a living state from the body of its mother," whether it has breathed or not, and homicide [may be inflicted by injuries "before, during, or after birth"; but "a living child in its mother's womb, or a child in the act of birth," even though it has breathed, is not a human being within the definition. The doctrine that to establish a charge of murdering a new born child, proof that it had breathed is not sufficient, was laid down by Mr. Justice Littledale in *Reg. v. Foulton* (5 C. & P. 329) and by Lord Wensleydale in *Reg. v. Enoch* (5 C. & P. 539); and the former thought that it should be proved that the whole body was brought alive into the world. On the other hand, Lord Wensleydale ruled, in *Reg. v. Brain* (6 C. & P. 349), that it was not essential for the prosecution to prove that the child had breathed.

The same section defines killing as "the act of causing the death of a person at any distance of time by some act or omission but for which the person killed would not have died when he did, and which is immediately connected with his death." It is to be a question

of fact whether the connection between the act or omission and the death is immediate; and the conduct of one person is not to be deemed the cause for the conduct of another, merely because the former supplies a motive for the latter, unless there is an incitement. This last proviso appears in the Digest (article 219) with the prefix "submitted," and with the addition that the person whose conduct supplies the motive is not an accessory before the fact. Section 132 enumerates the following as cases of homicide, even though the act is not the sole, or not the immediate cause of death. The first case is where a man inflicts on another an injury causing surgical or medical treatment, which causes death, it being immaterial whether the treatment was proper or mistaken, so long as it was employed in good faith and with common knowledge and skill. This case is illustrated in the Digest by the statement that, if a person wounded in a duel dies from the effects of the operation performed by a surgeon under a *bona fide* though mistaken belief in its necessity, he has been killed by the person who shot him; whereas if the surgeon has applied poison to the wound, whether *malâ fide* or negligently, he has been killed by the surgeon. The second case is where the injury would not have caused death if the injured person had submitted to proper surgical or medical treatment, or observed proper precautions as to his mode of living. Here the injury, though neither the sole nor the immediate cause, is the *causa sine qua non* of the death. The third case put is the case of causing a person by violence, or threats of violence, to do an act causing his own death, such act appearing to be the natural mode of avoiding such violence or threats. This appears to be founded on *Reg. v. Evans*, mentioned in Russell on Crimes, 5th ed., 651, where a man beat his wife and threatened to throw her out of a window, and in consequence of his threats she threw herself out and died from the combined effects of the blows and the fall, and Heath, Gibbs, and Bayley, JJ., concurred in holding that if the deceased had been constrained by her husband's threats of further violence, [and a well-grounded apprehension that he would do such further violence to her as would endanger her life, he was as much responsible for the fall as if he had thrown her out of the window himself. The fourth case is an act which does no more than accelerate the death of a person suffering under a disease or injury which, apart from the act, would have caused death; where, as is said in 1 Russell on Crimes, 5th ed., 676, "the person wounded does not die simply *ex visitatione Dei*, but his death is hastened by the hurt which he received; and it shall not be permitted to the offender to apportion his own wrong." The last case is where an act or omission causes death only because accompanied by the acts or omissions of the person killed or of other persons. In *Reg. v. Longbottom* (3 Cox. C. C. 439), Lord Cranworth ruled that, in a charge of causing death by negligence, the contributory negligence of the deceased is no defence, and the liability of all the agents jointly concerned in the act or omission causing the death is, of course, obvious.

By section 133 homicide is said to be unlawful in three cases, namely, when death is caused (a) "by an act done with the intention to cause death or bodily harm, or which is commonly known to be likely to cause death or bodily harm, and when the act accompanied with such intention is neither justified nor excused by law"; (b) by an omission, amounting to culpable negligence, to discharge a legal duty (whether accompanied or not by an intention to cause death or bodily injury); or (c) "accidentally by an unlawful act."

Section 134 defines murder as "unlawful homicide committed with (a) an intention to cause the death of, or grievous bodily harm to, any person, whether such person is the person actually killed or not; or (b) with knowledge that the act or omission to discharge a legal duty which causes death will probably cause the death of, or grievous bodily harm to, some person, whether such person is the person actually killed or not, although

such knowledge may be accompanied by indifference whether death or grievous bodily harm is caused or not, or by a wish that it may not be caused." All other cases of unlawful homicide will (by section 135) fall within the description of manslaughter, and the definition of murder is subject to the provisions of sections 136 and 137. By the former section, the fact that homicide was committed "in the heat of passion, caused by sudden provocation," will reduce the offence from murder to manslaughter. *Provocation* is to mean "any wrongful act or omission of such a nature as to be sufficient to deprive an ordinary person aggrieved thereby of the power of self-control," whether the act or omission amounts to a provocation being a question of fact, though the doing a thing which a person has a legal right to do is never to be deemed a provocation; but the latter section provides that provocation is not to extenuate the guilt of homicide if sought or voluntarily provoked by the offender as an excuse, nor if he was not deprived of the power of self-control, regard being had to the nature of the act, the interval between the provocation, and all circumstances tending to show his state of mind. These four sections will undoubtedly simplify the law on the subject of unlawful homicide. The making of the intention to kill or do grievous bodily harm to any person, or the knowledge that such will be the probable result of the act, the test of the distinction between murder and manslaughter is consistent with the existing state of the law, while we get rid of the technical distinction between killing with and killing without "malice aforethought," and also the necessity for deciding the question whether the act contemplated by the person causing death was a felony or not. Thus it is laid down by Foster, and was recognized as law by the Lord Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench as lately as 1868 in *R. v. Deemond*, the prosecution arising out of the Clerkenwell explosion, that if a man shoots at the poultry of another person and accidentally kills a man, the offence is murder if he had intended to steal the poultry, but manslaughter if he shot from wanton mischief or without actual felonious intent. This perhaps carries the test of felonious intent to the most absurd point, but the direction of the Lord Chief Justice in the last-mentioned case appears from the abstract given in a note to article 223 of the Digest to be identical in principle with the definition introduced in the new code.

The only other section in this chapter requiring special notice is the 146th, as to concealment of birth, which renders punishable "everyone . . . who, if any woman is delivered of a child, disposes of its dead body in any manner with intent to conceal the fact that its mother was delivered of it," but it is only to apply where the fetus has reached the period at which it might have been born alive. This last test appears to be founded on the direction of Sir William Erle in *Reg. v. Berriman* (6 Cox. C. C. 388). The section itself departs from the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100, s. 60, by omitting the words "by any secret disposition of the body," and it will obviate many difficulties which have arisen on the question, What is a "secret disposition"? Sir J. F. Stephen points out in a note to the Digest that to leave a child's body by night in a street might be a concealment of the fact of its birth, but it could not be punishable as a "secret disposition." Such an act is within the new code.

Acts injuring or endangering the person are dealt with in chapter 21. By section 147 "voluntarily causing" is to include both intentional causing and causing by means commonly known to be likely to cause the effect, and the phrase "dangerous instrument" is to be construed as including fire, explosive, poisonous, or corrosive substances, and "any living creature." One or two provisions in this chapter should be noticed; section 153 deals with "attempts to endanger railway passengers," and renders any person punishable who, "with intent to injure or endanger the safety of any person on any railway (a), does any act calculated to interfere with or directly or indirectly to cause injury to any carriage

engine, or truck, thereon; or (b), throws anything at, into, or upon, or causes anything to come into contact with any such thing or person; or (c) deals in any way with any signal or light on or near to the railway." This summarises the provisions of the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 160, ss. 32, 34, but does not alter or extend their provisions. Section 156, as to "administering poison," covers the same ground as the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100, ss. 23, 24, and unlawfully, knowingly, and intentionally "administers, or causes to be administered," any poison or other destructive or noxious thing is to be punishable, "although no injury may be inflicted thereby." If the act endanger life, or inflicts grievous bodily harm, the *maximum* sentence is to be ten years, instead of five years' penal servitude. Section 160 makes the following negligent acts or omissions punishable (the question whether a particular omission to discharge a legal duty amounts to culpable negligence being a question of fact)—(a) by an unlawful act or "omission to discharge any legal act amounting to culpable negligence," doing, or causing to be done, any bodily harm to, or endangering the life of, any person; or (b) by any such act or omission endangering the safety of any person "conveyed or being upon any railway." The first portion of the section appears to be new as a statutory enactment; the second portion enacts, without alteration, the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100, s. 54, and provides for cases where, in consequence of the absence of evidence of any intent to injure or endanger personal safety, section 153 is inapplicable.

Chapter 22 deals with assaults and intimidation. Section 161 contains an elaborate definition of assault, which is to include, first, "the act of applying unlawfully and voluntarily any the least force to the person of another, or to the dress worn by him, indirectly or directly." This is a clear enunciation of the common law definition of an assault, though the non-definition of the word "force," may seem to leave the description imperfect. The offence is to include, secondly, an attempt unlawfully to apply force in the manner previously mentioned; and, thirdly, "the act of using a gesture towards another, giving him reasonable grounds to believe that the person using that gesture means to apply to his person such actual force." Lastly, it includes the unlawfully depriving a person of his liberty. In each case the act must be done either without the consent of the assaulted person, or by his consent obtained through fraud. This definition of assault is almost identical with that proposed in article 241 of the Digest, and the illustrations there given show that the author intended to include such cases as setting a dog at another person (which would be an application of "force"), an indecent assault on a boy who acquiesces through ignorance of the nature of the act, as in *Reg. v. Lock* (21 W. R. 144, L. R. 2 C. C. R. 10), or inducing a woman to permit connection under pretence of being her husband. The section is further made subject to the proviso "that such acts as are reasonably necessary for the common intercourse of life are not assaults if they are done for the purpose of such intercourse only and with no greater force than the occasion requires." This proviso is explained by an illustration in the Digest, to the effect that if a man lays his hand upon another to attract his attention, no assault is committed.

The provisions of section 164 against "intimidation," are an exact reproduction of the definition given in the 38 & 39 Vict. c. 76, s. 7.

At the Winchester assizes, a widow of 70 years obtained £10 damages and costs against a widower of 71 for breach of promise of marriage. The plaintiff appeared in the witness box in widow's weeds and a false front. The former were for her late husband, who died a year before the engagement to the defendant, and the latter, she said, was rendered necessary by her hair having all fallen off in consequence of the defendant's heartless conduct.

Reviews.

SOLICITORS.

THE LAW RELATING TO SOLICITORS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE, WITH AN APPENDIX OF STATUTES AND RULES. By A. CORDERY, Barrister-at-law. Stevens & Sons.

We are not quite satisfied with Mr. Cordery's arrangement of his subject. He sets out, properly enough, after a general introduction on solicitors of the Supreme Court, with chapters on the qualifications of solicitors, unqualified practitioners, retainer and appointment of solicitors, and authority of solicitors; but after this the subjects are rather jumbled together. One would have expected the chapters on remuneration, costs, and lien to complete the consideration of the relation of the solicitor to his client; and the chapters on summary jurisdiction and disqualification of solicitors would properly have concluded the book. The subject of the right to practise in the different courts, treated of under the head of "Qualifications of Solicitors—Admission," would, we think, have been more appropriately dealt with under "Privileges of Solicitors." These are matters which we commend to the consideration of the author if he produces a second edition.

As to the matter of the book, we can bestow more commendation. Mr. Cordery writes tersely and usually clearly, and displays, in general, great industry and care in the collection of cases. We observe, for instance, the remarks of James, L.J., in *Grace v. Baynton* (reported in the notes of cases in our last volume) duly cited and observed upon. The omissions of cases we have noticed are very few and unimportant; we may, however, mention that, under the head of solicitors acting for the other side (p. 63), we find no reference to the case of *In re The Electric Power Company* (25 W. R. 603). So far as we have tested his statements of the effect of cases we have generally found them correct, and not mere servile reproductions of head-notes. But condensation, while a great merit in the author of a law book, has its dangers, and we cannot say Mr. Cordery has quite escaped them. He is a little apt to state his propositions too broadly. For instance, on page 158, instead of stating that "the master is civilly responsible even for the criminal conduct of the clerk in the course of his employment," it would have been better to give shortly the facts of the two cases (*Dunkley v. Farris*, 11 C. B. 457, and *Palmer v. Evans*, 1 C. B. N. S. 151) on which he bases this rather sweeping proposition. And on page 39 the statement that a married woman cannot appoint an attorney to make a surrender of copyholds, "even though her husband concurs in the appointment," should have been stated to be based on a *dictum* of Patteson, J. So in stating the effect of *Duke of Northumberland v. Todd* (26 W. R. 350), Mr. Cordery omits all reference to the essential circumstances that the country solicitors had acted in the subject-matter of the action before the commencement of the action, and during the action one of the partners had collected evidence and prepared affidavits. And, lastly, in the part of the work relating to retainer of a solicitor to take journeys, although reference is made to *Re Snell* (25 W. R. 736), there is no allusion to the subject of the effect of ratification by the client of the acts of the solicitor.

The *Central Law Journal* refers to three annual reports of Emil Dietzsch, coroner of Cook County, Chicago, which state that a majority of the persons who committed suicide were Germans. This fact the coroner traces to different causes in the two reports. In his second report he says: "The well-known national beverage of the Germans, lager beer, may have some influence upon their psychological peculiarities. The habitual use of beer seems to have a tendency to direct their psychological ailments into the form of a metamorphosis, from phlegmatic case to melancholy, and, finally, suicidal mania."

Cases of the Week.

COMPANY—WINDING UP—PAID-UP SHARES—NON-REGISTRATION OF CONTRACT—CERTIFICATE—BONA FIDE HOLDER FOR VALUE—ESTOPPEL—COMPANIES ACT, 1867 (30 & 31 VICT. c. 131), s. 25.—In the House of Lords, on the 11th inst., the appeal of *Burkinshaw v. Nicholls* was heard and decided. The case involved the question of the liability, in the winding up of a company, of a transferee of shares who had received certificates stating that their whole value had been paid up, when, in fact, the amount had not been paid in cash. The shares had been originally issued to a person who had sold land to the company, it being agreed that a portion of the purchase-money should be taken by him in paid-up shares. These shares were registered in the company's books as fully paid for in cash, and certificates to the same effect were handed to the vendor, but the contract was not registered in accordance with the 30 & 31 Vict. c. 131, s. 25, which provides that "every share in any company shall be deemed and taken to have been issued and to be held subject to the payment of the whole amount thereof in cash, unless the same shall have been otherwise determined by a contract duly made in writing, and filed with the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies at or before the issue of such shares." The shares in question were afterwards transferred *bona fide* and for valuable consideration, without notice that they had not been paid for in cash. The company was afterwards wound up, and the official liquidator sought to make the transferee a contributory for the nominal value of his shares, on the ground that the above section had not been complied with. The chief clerk placed the name upon the list of contributories, and this decision was affirmed by Hall, V.C., in chambers, but his judgment was reversed by the Court of Appeal (Jessel, M.R., James and Thesiger, L.JJ.) on the 16th of January last (see *The British Farmers' Pure Linseed Cake Company, Nicholls's case*, ante, p. 225, 26 W. R. 334, L. R. 7 Ch. D. 533). The official liquidator appealed to the House of Lords, and it was argued that the issue of a certificate alleging that the shares were fully paid up did not estop the official liquidator from proving that such was not the fact, and that the contract not having been registered, the statute imposed a liability for the full value of the shares upon every subsequent holder. Lords Cairns, C., Hatherley, Selborne, Blackburn, and Gordon concurred in affirming the judgment of the Court of Appeal. The original holder of the shares would, by the statute, have continued liable for their full amount, but in the case of a *bona fide* holder for value the company were estopped by their certificate from denying that the full value was paid, and the official liquidator must stand in the same position.

PETITIONING CREDITOR'S DEBT—DEBT VESTED IN TRUSTEES ON TRUST FOR ABSOLUTE BENEFICIAL OWNER—BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1869, s. 6.—In a case of *Ex parte Culley*, before the Court of Appeal on the 11th inst., the question was raised whether the provision of section 6 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, that "the debt of the petitioning creditor must be a liquidated sum due at law or in equity" has abolished the old rule in bankruptcy that where the legal owner of a debt was a mere trustee of it for an absolute beneficial owner, the legal owner could not alone sustain a petition for adjudication of bankruptcy against the debtor, but both the legal and the beneficial owners must join in the petition. A judgment debt was due from A. to E. E. assigned the debt for value to C., and notice of the assignment was given to A. C. was, in fact, a mere trustee for G., who paid the consideration for the assignment. C. presented a bankruptcy petition against A., and the court (James, Brett, and Cotton, L.JJ.) held that the petition could not be sustained in the absence of G. In support of the petition, reliance was placed on the above enactment of section 6, and on the decision of Bacon, C.J., in *Ex parte Cooper* (23 W. R. 950, L. R. 20 Eq. 762) that, by virtue of section 6, the equitable assignee of a debt could petition in his own name, without joining the assignor, for adjudication against the debtor, a thing which could not have been done prior to the Act of 1869. The court, however, said that in that case the real owner of the debt, not a mere nominal owner, was before the court. The reason for the old rule was that the court might have the oath

of the real owner of the debt that it had not been discharged or satisfied in any way, but that it was still due. The debt might be still due at law, and the legal owner might be able to swear that it was still due to him, while, as between the debtor and the beneficial owner, it might have been satisfied in equity. Of course, the rule could only apply where there was an absolute beneficial owner capable of releasing the debt, and of being brought before the court. It would not apply to a debt vested in a trustee for persons not absolute owners, or persons under disability. Section 6 was not intended to alter this rule. The distinction in it was between debts recoverable in a court of law and debts recoverable in a court of equity, but it had nothing to do with the character in which the owner of the debt, legal or equitable, held it. If there were a mere trustee and an absolute beneficial owner the latter must still join in the petition.

PRACTICE—STAYING PROCEEDINGS PENDING APPEAL—JURISDICTION OF COURT OF APPEAL—ORD. 58, RR. 16, 17.—In a case of *The Attorney-General v. The Swansea Tramways Company*, before the Court of Appeal on the 17th inst., the question arose whether the Court of Appeal has an original jurisdiction to order a stay of proceedings under a judgment pending an appeal. At the trial of the action on the 18th of June, Hall, V.C., gave judgment, restraining the defendants from using locomotives worked by steam power upon their tramway, suspending, however, the operation of the injunction until after the 18th of July. On the 28th of June the defendants served notice of appeal, and on the 11th of July they moved before the Vice-Chancellor for a stay of proceedings under the judgment pending the appeal. The Vice-Chancellor thought there should not be a stay of proceedings unless the Court of Appeal should be of opinion that the case was one in which the hearing of the appeal ought to be advanced, and he ordered the motion to stand over until an application should have been made to the Court of Appeal to advance the appeal. The defendants then applied by original motion to the Court of Appeal to advance the appeal, and to stay the proceedings under the judgment until a month after the appeal should have been heard and disposed of. The court (Jessel, M.R., and Brett and Cotton, L.J.J.) were of opinion that no sufficient reason had been shown for advancing the appeal, and they accordingly refused that part of the motion. It was then urged that the court had an original jurisdiction to direct a stay of proceedings pending the appeal, and reliance was placed upon an observation made by Mellish, L.J., in *Cooper v. Cooper* (L. R. 2 Ch. D. 492) to the effect that an application made to the Court of Appeal under rule 17 of order 58 is an original motion, not an appeal. The court, however, said that the meaning of this observation could only have been that such a motion need not be formally set down as an appeal. It must necessarily be a motion by way of appeal, for the court of first instance and the Court of Appeal could not have a co-ordinate jurisdiction. The motion, so far as it sought a stay of proceedings was accordingly ordered to stand over until after the motion before the Vice-Chancellor should have been disposed of. [We should add that by the note of *Cooper v. Cooper* (20 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 469), it appears that after the application to stay proceedings had been made to the Vice-Chancellor, it was renewed in the Court of Appeal without a fresh notice of motion, and that the court required a new notice of motion in the Court of Appeal to be given, on the ground that rule 17 requires that such an application should be made first to the primary judge, and in another case of *Maclean v. Vaughan* (20 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 723), Mellish L.J., said that the jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal on such an application is primary, not appellate, though the application must be made in the first instance to the court whose decision is appealed from.]

PRACTICE—CONSOLIDATION OF ACTIONS—JUDGMENT BY DEFAULT—SUBSTITUTION OF ANOTHER ACTION AS TEST ACTION—ORD. 51, R. 4.—In a case of *Amos v. Chadwick*, before the Court of Appeal on the 17th inst., a question arose as to the proper course of procedure where an action which had been selected as a test action, to decide a question common to a number of actions brought by different plaintiffs against the same defendants, had not been really

tried, but judgment had been given against the plaintiff in default of his appearance at the trial. The action of *Amos v. Chadwick* and seventy-seven other actions were brought by shareholders in a company against the persons who had promoted the formation of the company, claiming damages on the ground that the plaintiffs had been respectively induced to apply for and take shares by means of a prospectus issued by the defendants which contained fraudulent misrepresentations. On the 23rd of February, 1877, upon the application of the plaintiffs in all the actions, an order was made by Malins, V.C., that *Robinson v. Chadwick*, one of the actions, should be a test action to determine as against all the plaintiffs the liability of the defendants for the alleged misrepresentations. The plaintiffs each gave an undertaking to this effect, but, in order to provide for the possibility of the defendants having different defences, such as knowledge or acquiescence in each case, the order provided that they should not be bound by the test action. When the test action came on for trial before Fry, J. (L. R. 7 Ch. D. 878, ante, p. 411), the plaintiff asked that the trial might be postponed for a month, and, as the court refused to assent to this, the plaintiff declined to proceed with his case, and judgment was given for the defendants with costs. The plaintiff's refusal was accounted for by the fact that he had asked the other plaintiffs to give him an indemnity against costs, and they had declined to do so, and there was evidence that the plaintiff was not in a fit state of health to be examined in court. The plaintiffs in the other actions then applied to Malins, V.C., to substitute another of the actions as a test action, and he made an order substituting *Smith v. Chadwick* for *Robinson v. Chadwick*. The defendants appealed, and it was urged on their behalf that the plaintiffs were bound by the result of the trial of *Robinson v. Chadwick*. The Court of Appeal (Jessel, M.R., and Brett and Cotton, L.J.J.) held that the order of substitution had been properly made. They said that the intention of the original order was that the question which was common to all the actions should have a real and fair trial upon the hearing of evidence, and that, as this intention had been defeated without any fault of the other plaintiffs, the court had a judicial discretion to modify the original order, even though that order contained no express reservation of a right to do so. Of course, if it had been shown that the trial of the action selected as a test action had proved abortive in consequence of any fault of the other plaintiffs, the case would have stood in a wholly different position. But the other plaintiffs were not bound to give the plaintiff in the test action an indemnity against costs.

COMPANY—VOLUNTARY WINDING UP—RIGHT OF CREDITOR HAVING AN UNSATISFIED JUDGMENT TO SUPERVISION ORDER.—COMPANIES ACT, 1862, s. 147.—In the case of *In re Salvage Steamship Company (Limited)*, before the Master of the Rolls on the 13th inst., the company had passed a resolution for a voluntary winding up, and a creditor holding an unsatisfied judgment, and who was restrained from issuing execution on the application of the voluntary liquidator, now presented a petition that the winding up might be continued under the supervision of the court. The petition contained no allegation that the winding up was being improperly proceeded with; it stated the debt, that the company was insolvent, and that it was desirable that another claim against the company should be independently investigated under the authority of the court. The Master of the Rolls dismissed the petition with costs, being of opinion that to entitle a creditor to a supervision order under section 147 of the Company's Act, 1862, some special case for interference must be made out.

CHARITABLE LEGACY—OBJECT PARTLY ILLEGAL—REPAIR OF TOMB—WHOLE FUND GIVEN TO CHARITY—TRUSTEE RELIEF ACT—EXPENSIVE METHOD OF PROCEDURE—CHEAPER MODE BY ADMINISTRATION SUMMONSES.—In a petition of *Re Birkett*, also before the Master of the Rolls on the 13th inst., the question arose as to the validity of a bequest of £500 to the incumbent of a church, "the income to be applied, when necessary, in keeping in good repair the grave of the father of the testatrix, and the remainder (if any) of the income to be applied by the incumbent for the time being in providing wine and bread for the sick poor" of the same place. The executor had paid the sum into court under the

Trustee Relief Act, and the incumbent now petitioned for payment out to him. It was admitted that the bequest for the maintenance of the tomb was bad, but it was contended, on the authority of *Fisk v. Attorney-General* (15 W. R. 1200, L. R. 4 Eq. 321), *Hunter v. Bullock* (20 W. R. 460, L. R. 14 Eq. 45), *Dawson v. Small* (22 W. R. 514, L. R. 18 Eq. 114), and *In re Williams* (25 W. R. 689, L. R. 5 Ch. D. 735), that the residue of the gift in favour of the poor was good, and that the money ought to be paid out to the petitioner. The respondents relied on the principle laid down in *Chapman v. Brown* (6 Ves. 404), and recognized in *Magistrates of Dundee v. Morris* (3 Macq. 134) that the whole gift was bad on the ground that it was uncertain what amount ought to be applied in the maintenance of the tomb or that the gift was bad *qua* the amount that would be required for the repair of the tomb. The Master of the Rolls said that if he had been untrammelled by authority he should have considered that the correct principle was laid down in *Chapman v. Brown*. If you could not fairly ascertain what would be the extreme sum required for the trust purpose, then if that trust purpose was void the contingent surplus could not be ascertained and the whole gift ought to fail. He, however, thought that no judge of first instance should disregard such a series of decisions as there had been by other judges of co-ordinate jurisdiction. In *Fisk v. Attorney-General*, Vice-Chancellor Wood, in 1867, differing from *Chapman v. Brown*, decided that the whole gift was good as to the charitable objects in a case exactly similar to the present. That case had been followed under almost precisely similar circumstances by Vice-Chancellor Bacon, twice in *Hunter v. Bullock* and *Dawson v. Small*, and recently by Vice-Chancellor Malins in *In re Williams*. He should, therefore, simply follow those decisions and hold the whole bequest to be good as to the charitable objects. The fund would be paid out to the official charity trustee and the income as it accrued would be handed over to the incumbent for the time being. In reference to the costs, those of the petitioner would come out of the fund, but he should make no order as to the respondents' costs, which must come out of the residue. He further stated that he regretted that the money had been paid into court under the Trustee Relief Act, as that proceeding necessitated an expensive petition and was altogether a costly process. It was very rarely that an executor was justified in so doing; a much cheaper method (as this was personal estate) was by taking out an administration summons in which all accounts could be waived, and his opinion taken in chambers on summons. Another mode, after the administration summons had been taken out, was for the parties to agree on a statement of facts in the nature of a special case for his decision in chambers. If necessary, of course, the summonses could be adjourned into court for argument.

On Wednesday, says the *Times*, at the High Court of Justiciary, Edinburgh, the Lord Justice Clerk presiding, Simon Fraser, convicted on Monday of having on the 10th of April last murdered his child in Glasgow while in a state of somnambulism, was brought again to the bar. The judge, in setting the prisoner at liberty, said he understood that arrangements had been made which might have the effect of guarding against a repetition of such a disaster, and he impressed upon him that he was bound to take every possible means that he could to save himself from those unfortunate fits which had caused so much misery.

A meeting of the members of the legal profession was held, says the *New Zealand Jurist*, on February 14 at Auckland, for the purpose of establishing a law society. There were thirty-two gentlemen present. Mr. Whitaker was voted to the chair. The objects of the new society are to frame rules for the conduct of the profession, to protect the public against unauthorized practitioners, to recommend a standard of legal education, to establish a legally-constituted body, to whom should be referred all cases of dereliction or offences against the practice of the profession as authorized by the statute, and for the control of various matters relating to the conduct of legal business. On the motion of Mr. Brookfield, it was resolved, "That a law society be established." The meeting elected the officers of the society, Mr. Whitaker being chosen president.

LEGAL OFFICES COMMITTEE.

The following is the report of the Judicature Acts (Legal Offices) Committee:—
May it please your Lordships,

We, the committee appointed by your lordships in conjunction with the Lord Chancellor to consider the effects of the Judicature Acts upon the administrative offices of the courts of justice, and to report upon any changes which it may be desirable to make in the organization of these offices, having inquired into the matters mentioned in the reference to us, beg to submit the following report to your lordships.

We considered it desirable before proceeding to take evidence that some members of the committee should visit in person the various offices, the subjects of our inquiry, to see their internal arrangements and working, and to judge of the character of the duties performed by the staffs. Three of our number undertook this duty, and the opinions they formed were communicated to us and have been confirmed by our subsequent inquiries.

We have also had the advantage of hearing the evidence of the heads of the principal departments which will be affected by our recommendations, of two of the clerks of assize, of several solicitors in large practice, and of others whose experience would render them fully alive to the advantages and disadvantages of the present system, and would enable them to appreciate the effect of the changes which were suggested to them when before the committee.

Having considered the objections made by some of the witnesses to the changes we suggest, as well as other objections which have occurred to us in the course of our inquiry, it seems to us that they would be either remedied by time and experience or be far outweighed by the advantages that would accrue to the public from such changes.

We agree with the recommendations of the Legal Departments Commission that a central office for the Supreme Court should be established, and we propose to show how the concentration of various existing offices in the central office would, in our opinion, be best effected.

This central office should be under the control and supervision of masters of the Supreme Court, and the business and staffs of the following offices should be transferred to this office: that is to say—

The Record and Writ Clerks' Office (Chancery Division).
The Enrolment Office (Chancery Division).
The Report Office (Chancery Division).

All offices of the Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, Exchequer, and Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Divisions, except the staff employed solely on the non-contentious probate business.

The offices to be transferred will include—

The Bills of Sale Office.
The Crown Office.
The Queen's Remembrancer Office.

The Registry of Certificates of Acknowledgments of Deeds by Married Women.

The Registry of Judgments, to which should be added the Registry of County Court Judgments.

After such transfer the business of the central office should be divided into convenient departments, to each of which a distinct portion of the business should be allotted. For instance, there should be a writ department, an appearance department, a rule department, a taxing department, a judgment department, and the like.

We now proceed to consider the questions that have arisen with respect to the several offices proposed to be transferred.

The Record and Writ Clerks, Enrolment, and Report Offices (Chancery Division).

We think that no difficulty will arise from transferring these offices with their staffs to the central office, and that there will be a considerable gain both in uniformity of practice and in economy of clerks. Nearly all the technical and peculiar duties in which these offices differed from the common law offices have ceased to exist, and no business remains which, in our opinion, an intelligent clerk from any of the other legal departments could not in a short time learn to transact. At present the Record and Writ Clerks' Office is, we think, overmanned for the ordinary run of business. By transferring these offices to the central office and making the staffs interchangeable with those of the other departments

we think that a considerable reduction in numbers might be effected, as, while a staff sufficient for the ordinary work of the department only would be permanently occupied, any requirements of these departments at moments of pressure could be met out of the general staff of the office. The heads of these offices should be transferred to the central office and have the supervision of departmental staffs, but on vacancies occurring we think their places should not be filled up.

Offices of the Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer Divisions.

The business of these offices for writs, appearances, rules, and judgments should, when transferred to the central office, together with similar business from the Chancery Division, be conducted in common without distinction of divisions, but should be divided into departments, so as to make one department for writs, another for appearances, a third for rules, and a fourth for judgments. In these departments the seats should be divided into alphabetical divisions, at which the business should be transacted according to the names of the plaintiffs in the actions, but the writs would continue to be made out as at present for each division, and also to be marked with the name of the judge in the Chancery Division. As regards all the business of the central office, we think that the staff of each department, though assigned primarily to its own, should be interchangeable with that of any other department, as required.

Masters and Registrars.

There are fifteen masters at present, exclusive of the Queen's Coroner and Master of the Crown Office, five being assigned to the Queen's Bench Division, five to the Common Pleas, and five to the Exchequer. Their duties are to tax costs, to sit at judges' chambers, and hear and decide interlocutory applications, &c., to take references, to attend the divisional court, to examine witnesses *de bene esse*, and to exercise a control over the subordinate officers of these divisions. Each master performs these duties for the division to which he is assigned.

We think the duty of attending a divisional court in the Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer Divisions, except as regards Crown business, may be dispensed with, as it appears that it is very seldom necessary for the judges to consult the masters in civil business. We recommend that a competent clerk from the rule department should attend the court, and perform the duties now discharged by the Masters. By relieving the masters from attendance in court it may, and we think will, be found possible to reduce their number by two; but, as to this, we think experience only can show what number of masters will be required to conduct with efficiency the business of the central office.

We recommend that the masters should no longer be assigned to divisions, but that each should bear the title of Master of the Supreme Court and perform all the duties of his office, irrespective of division, except as to the Crown Office and the probate business, concerning which we propose special provisions should be made. So far as possible, as regards the conduct of business within the office, we recommend that the distinction of divisions should be abolished.

Crown Office.

As regards this office, the technical nature of the practice renders it impossible there should be for the present a fusion with the other departments of the central office. We have been informed that a considerable amount of experience in this particular work is necessary before an officer or clerk can be of much practical use in the office, and we are unable, therefore, to recommend that the staff of this office should be interchangeable with the general staff of the central office to the same extent as in the other departments with which we have dealt.

The attendance of a master in the divisional court of the Queen's Bench Division is required to assist the judges on points of practice relating to the Crown business. It is necessary that such master should have had special experience and training to render him competent to perform his duty, and he must, therefore, be supplied from this department.

We recommend, that although the office should become part of the central office, it should form a separate department, to be called "the Queen's Coroner's Department,"

under the Queen's Coroner and a master specially assigned to it, and with a staff whose duty should be primarily to attend to the work in their own, but who should be liable to be called on to perform duties in any other department of the central office.

We hope that there may be eventually such a simplification of the practice as to render it unnecessary to assign special officers to this department, but, in the meantime, in the event of the Queen's Coroner, master, or any clerk of this department being incapacitated temporarily from work by illness or any other cause, we think that some other master or clerk of the central office should perform his duties.

The Registrar's Offices of the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Divisions.

We recommend that the registrars of these divisions should assume the name and position of masters, but that, considering the special nature of the practice as to probate business, the four present probate registrars should, in the first instance, be specially assigned to this branch of business, but although attending primarily thereto they should, if required, be liable to perform the other duties of a master of the Supreme Court.

The masters assigned to the probate business should conduct the non-contentious business at Somerset House, and attend in court, as at present, and also give such assistance as regards contentious business at the central office as may be found necessary.

Taxing Office.

We recommend that a taxing department should be established in the central office for the taxation of costs in all the divisions of the High Court, with the exception of the Chancery Division. The taxing in that division could not, we think, be conveniently performed by the common law masters, because chancery costs are so different in their nature that they could not with advantage be taxed in this department.

We recommend that a sufficient number of masters be assigned to attend by rotation at the taxing department, performing no other duty while so attending. We think it will be an advantage to the profession and the public that solicitors should be able to apply at an office where taxation is being regularly carried on, and where they may get their bills of costs taxed without delay. We think that six masters will be required for this purpose, but the number must of course be regulated by what experience may show to be necessary.

Associates' Office.

This office should form a department of the central office, but considering the nature of the duties the associates have to perform, we think this office should be held by gentlemen of good position. We do not however think, particularly having regard to the fact that the *visi prius* courts will all soon be under one roof, that so many as three associates will be required, and we recommend that the next vacancy among these officers should not be filled up, and that the number of associates should then be reduced to two.

By this arrangement there will be one associate free to attend in whatever court his services are required, while the other can conduct and supervise the work of his department in the central office.

As to the relations that might be created between the staff of the Associates' Office and the Crown Office, and the staffs of the circuit officers, we are of opinion that the present system as regards the principal officers of the circuits is as efficient and economical as any that could be suggested, but we think that in case of additional assistance being required on circuit it might be provided from the staff of the Associates' Department and the Queen's Coroner's Department. We are informed that during the circuits three clerks could, as a rule, be spared from the Associates' Office, and we recommend, therefore, that, on vacancies occurring in the circuit staffs, those places should to this number be filled up from that department. We think also that in the intervals between the circuits, such members of the circuit staffs as would consent to act, should render assistance in the Associates' Department when necessary, on such special terms as might be from time to time arranged.

Queen's Remembrancer's Office.

We think that, although the work of this office is to a certain extent peculiar, the duties are not so special as to render it necessary to retain it as a separate office, and it

would, in our judgment, be exceedingly undesirable, while merging all the common law offices in one central office, to exclude a small office of this character, unless the work were of so special a nature as to render it necessary to do so. The office of Queen's Remembrancer should, we think, in future be held by the senior master of the Supreme Court, with such additional salary for performing this duty as may be fixed by the Treasury in conjunction with the Lord Chancellor.

Registry of Judgments (Common Pleas), Registry of County Court Judgments, and Registry of Certificates of Acknowledgments of Deeds by Married Women.

We have recommended that these offices should be transferred to the central office.

On vacancies occurring in the offices of registrar of judgments, county court judgments, or certificates of acknowledgment of deeds by married women, we think the senior master should become registrar of all these offices, his increased salary as Queen's Remembrancer being understood to cover these additional duties, but any of the other masters should be empowered to act in this department in the absence of the senior master, and the supervision of these offices should be treated as part of the business of the central office.

Judges' Chambers.

The existing staff of chamber clerks is at present sufficient to do the work required at judges' chambers, except sometimes during the circuits, but we recommend that as vacancies arise their places should be supplied by a permanent staff of clerks, to be selected from the general staff of the central office, and that such clerks shall execute the duties of issuing summonses, drawing up orders, and all other duties at judges' chambers. These clerks, though forming part of the general staff of the central office, and being under the control of the masters, should be specially assigned to the several duties. We are not able to say positively what number of clerks will be required for this work, but, as far as we are able to judge, we think it need not exceed nine. This, however, must depend on the amount of work after the establishment of the office, when the staff may be reduced or increased as is found necessary.

It appears to us that if solicitors were permitted to draw up summonses, instead of their being drawn up as at present by chamber clerks, the work might be considerably diminished.

Material assistance might, we think, also be rendered to the staff of this department if the junior clerk of the judge in attendance at chambers were to assist in the issuing of summonses, a duty he should be thoroughly competent to perform, and which we recommend should be imposed upon him.

Control of Central Office.

In establishing such a central office as we recommend, to include the departments we have mentioned, we have given careful consideration to the question whether an officer should be appointed on whom should devolve the maintenance of discipline, the care of the internal regulations of the office, and the power of transferring clerks from one department to another. We are of opinion, however, that it will be best to leave these matters for arrangement among the masters themselves, but we think some one of the masters, selected in rotation or otherwise, should be in attendance always at the central office for this purpose. While so employed he should perform no other duty, but be accessible for reference on any questions that may arise as to the conduct of the business and regulation of the discipline of the office.

Classification of Clerks.

We have been asked (question 14 of our reference) whether a uniform classification of clerks throughout the legal departments could be made, and in answer to this we beg to say we are of opinion that this would be practicable within the central office, but not throughout the legal departments, there being some offices excepted from the operation of our scheme, to which we shall refer later in our report, where such a classification would not be applicable. As regards the central office, we think the following classes of clerks would provide satisfactorily for the conduct of the business:

(1) Principal clerks, where required.

(2) A sufficient number of first-class clerks, who should be capable of rising to the rank of principal clerk.

(3) A sufficient number of second-class clerks, equivalent to those known as lower division clerks in the Civil Service, who should not be capable of rising above this rank.

(4) A sufficient number of writers for copying.

We are not able to fix the number of clerks that may be required, as that must be a matter which experience only can decide when the central office is established. We think the salaries should be uniform in each class.

We wish to lay considerable emphasis on the advantages that will accrue to the public service by the complete interchangeability of the clerks between the various departments, with the exception to some extent possibly of the Queen's Coroner's Department. By such interchangeability we think uniformity of practice in the initial and other proceedings in all matters will be attained, and such minor differences of practice as have hitherto existed between the different divisions will gradually disappear. Although for the present the existing officers will remain, the control of the entire office will be in the hands of the masters, and this will also conduce to the same end, which is in our view eminently desirable.

Examiners.

We have been asked whether it is necessary to retain the office of examiner in chancery. We are of opinion that so long as the present system of taking evidence exists it will be necessary to retain this office.

Offices excepted.

We have excepted from the fusion of the offices of the courts of justice in the central office the following offices, respecting which we propose to make some observations before concluding our report:—

The Registrar's Office in Chancery.

The Taxing Offices in Chancery.

The Office of Secretary of Causes (Order of Course Office at the Rolls).

The Lord Chancellor's Principal Secretary's Office in Quality-court.

The Petty Bag Office.

As regards the registrars' and taxing masters' offices in chancery, the duties in these offices, being to a great extent non-contentious or administrative, are of so different a character to those in the other offices which we have recommended should form departments of the central office that there would be no advantage in amalgamating them. The matters dealt with by the officers and clerks are of such a nature as would not admit of their being attended to by the officers or clerks of any other department; so, even were they placed in the central office, they would of necessity remain distinct from the other departments, and under the circumstances we think no advantage would be gained by altering their present position.

Office of the Secretary of Causes at the Rolls (Order of Course Office).

We do not recommend the transfer of this office to the central office. The work is conducted by the head of the office, with two clerks, who are fully occupied. We think that on the occurrence of a vacancy it is worthy of consideration whether a permanent officer should be appointed as the head of this office, with a revised salary.

Lord Chancellor's Principal Secretary's Office.

We are of opinion that on the occurrence of a vacancy in the staff of the Lord Chancellor's principal secretary's office, in Quality-court, the distribution of the business in that office, more particularly of the answering of the petitions, should be considered.

The Petty Bag Office.

Although we do not recommend the immediate transfer of this office to the central office, we think on a vacancy occurring in the office of clerk of the petty bag that it should then be transferred to the central office, and placed under the control of the masters, the staff being interchangeable, as in the case of other departments, and that the office of clerk of petty bag should not be filled up.

Payment of Money into and out of Court.

Our attention has been drawn by one of the masters when giving evidence before us to the present practice adopted with regard to money paid into court by suitors. It appears that the parties lodge the money (occasionally very small

sums) with a clerk at the masters' office of the division to which the action belongs, taking a receipt from this clerk. The moneys so paid in during the day are paid by the clerk into a private bank to the account of the masters, and we understand that there are four banks at which accounts are kept for the several divisions. When the amount so lodged in the private bank has accumulated to £1,000 or £2,000, the masters draw a cheque and pay the accumulated sum into the Bank of England, where it remains until it is paid out to the parties, when the masters draw a cheque on the Bank of England for that purpose.

It appears to us that this practice is not only unnecessarily cumbersome, but may involve a certain amount of risk, and we consider that a preferable plan would be that the suitor lodging the money should receive a certificate equivalent to the form known in public offices as a "receivable order," which he might take to the Bank of England, who would, on the presentation of the receivable order, take the money and carry it to the proper account. By this means the intermediate employment of private banks would be avoided. Arrangements could probably be made to conduct this business at a branch office of the Bank of England, where cheques of the chancery paymaster may be cashed.

General Recommendations.

We are of opinion that, taking into consideration the right of appointment to the various offices under the existing arrangements, that the following scheme would provide satisfactorily for the future appointment of the principal officers. The masters should be appointed in rotation by the Lord Chief Justice of England, the Master of the Rolls, the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, the Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer, and the President of the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Divisions, with the exception of the Queen's Coroner and the master assigned to his department, whose appointments should, as at present, be in the hands of the Lord Chief Justice of England.

The associates are at present appointed by the presidents of their respective divisions, and we recommend that the two associates whom we propose should be retained as heads of their departments should be appointed in turn by the presidents of the three common law divisions.

If your lordships should decide to adopt the recommendations we have made we must point out that the sanction of the Legislature must previously be obtained.

We have not thought it within the scope of our reference to deal with the question of the salaries of the clerks of the various offices in detail, but it appears to us that, in order to ensure the satisfactory working of the scheme we recommend, provision should be made for these matters being dealt with by competent authority, in order that the salaries of the various classes of clerks should be placed on a satisfactory basis, and that the inequalities which now exist between those of different clerks doing work of a similar character should be rectified as soon as possible.

It being impossible to provide by anticipation for all the questions that may arise with regard to the internal arrangements and interchangeability of the officers and clerks of the various departments, we recommend that power should be reserved to the Lord Chancellor, in conjunction with the Treasury, to make such arrangements from time to time in respect of all the matters we have referred to as they may think fit.

We have made our recommendations on the presumption throughout that in a short time there will be the means of providing accommodation for the various offices which we propose to centre under one roof.

We submit the foregoing recommendations to your lordships as our report upon the questions referred to us, and as, in our opinion, providing a scheme by which uniformity of practice and economy of staff combined with efficiency will best be obtained, and the adoption of which will, we think, be of material benefit to the public.

To the Lords Commissioners of her Majesty's Treasury, and the Right Honourable the Lord Chancellor.

(Signed) G. JESSEL, M.R. (Chairman).
ROBT. LUSH.
FARRER HERSHELL.
WILLIAM LAW.
FRANCIS W. ROWSELL.
EDWD. F. BURTON.
HENRY LEIGH PEMBERTON.

HAMILTON CUFFE, Secretary.

Societies.

UNITED LAW STUDENTS SOCIETY.

A meeting was held at Clement's-inn Hall on Wednesday the 17th inst., Mr. D. B. Collyer, B.A., in the chair. The election of members to serve on the committee appointed last week, for inquiring into the subject of legal education, took place. The gentlemen elected were Mr. W. C. Owen, Mr. E. C. Rawlings, Mr. W. Dowson, Mr. A. H. Spokes, and Mr. E. H. Quicke. All communications on the matter should be addressed to the honorary secretary of the committee, Mr. E. H. Quicke, Rugby Chambers, Great James-street, W.C.

BIRMINGHAM LAW STUDENTS SOCIETY.

The Spring session of this society was brought to a close by a mock trial, held on June 25, and adjourned to July 16. There was a very large attendance of members of both branches of the profession in addition to a large number of students, and the experiment, which was the first of its kind, proved highly successful. John Harris and Michael O'Flanagan were put upon their trial on a charge of feloniously and burglariously breaking into and entering, with intent to steal, the house of Robert Henry Fortescue, of No. 548, Hagley-road, Edgbaston, in the county of Warwick. Mr. J. Loxdale Warren, barrister-at-law, presided as judge on the first evening, and Mr. W. S. Rogers on the adjournment (Mr. Warren not being able to be present), and the ordinary members of the society present and not engaged in the case officiated as jury. Messrs. Robinson and Hooper (instructed by Mr. C. J. Edwards), appeared for the prosecution, and Mr. Tyler (instructed by Mr. J. M. Bayley), for the prisoner Harris, and Mr. Plant (instructed by Mr. J. M. Bayley), for the prisoner O'Flanagan. Messrs. Harvey-Samuel, Crookford, P. M. Butlin, and Garland, were examined and cross-examined as witnesses for the prosecution, and Messrs. Shore and W. E. Taylor as witnesses for the defence. The trial was conducted as nearly as possible in the same manner as a criminal prosecution at the assizes. The jury found the prisoner Harris not guilty and the prisoner O'Flanagan guilty, and the latter was sentenced by the learned judge to fourteen years' penal servitude.

WORCESTER LEGAL DEBATING CLUB.

The annual meeting and dinner of this club took place at the Hundred House Hotel, Great Witley, on the 4th inst. There were present—Messrs. Taylor (in the chair), Davis, Jeffery, Spofforth (hon. sec.), Corbett, Caldicott, Miller, Thompson, Beauchamp, T. G. Stallard, Lambert, Blake-way, and Macdonald (members); and Messrs. Pidcock, Bentley, Williams, Stallard, and Barclay (friends of members).

The chairman, after dinner, proposed the usual loyal and patriotic toasts, that of "The Army, Navy, and Reserve Forces," being responded to by Lieut. Beauchamp, of the Rifles, and Lieut. Spofforth of the 1st W. A. V.

"The health of the President, Vice-President, Committee, and Hon. Secretary of the Worcester and Worcestershire Law Society," was proposed by Mr. Miller, and responded to in a facetious speech by Mr. Pidcock.

"Success to the Worcester Legal Debating Club," was proposed by Mr. Caldicott, coupling with the toast the name of the secretary. Mr. Spofforth responded, and read the annual report of the committee, which was very satisfactory. The adoption of the report was moved by Mr. Blake-way, seconded by Mr. Beauchamp, and carried unanimously.

"The health of the Committee" was proposed by Mr. Lambert, and responded to by Mr. Davis.

Legal News.

At the Durham Assizes on July 11, in an action of *Trotter v. Elliot*, the executors of the late Mr. William Dale Trotter, solicitor, claimed £2,000 (over and above payments made on account, stated to be £1,300) for services rendered at the election for North Durham during the autumn of 1868. The defendant admitted the employment, but pleaded payment, and also that the accounts were not duly delivered in accordance with the Corrupt Practices Prevention Acts, that the charges were unreasonable, and, further, that the claim was barred by the Statute of Limitations. To this the plaintiffs replied that the claim had been revived by a promise to pay, and, further, was taken out of the statute by payments on account. At the trial *Herschell, Q.C.*, for the plaintiffs, admitted that he was unable to answer the plea of the statute insisted on by the defendant, and a verdict was entered for the defendant.

The *Times* states that the Select Committee on the County Court Bills has come to the following conclusions:—1. That there be no increase in the jurisdiction of county courts protected by costs. 2. That the concurrent jurisdiction now existing should be extended, as shown in the bill as reported. 3. That the costs of the summons or plaint-note should be reduced. 4. That the salaries of the judges should be raised to £2,000 per annum, and that they should be entitled to pensions of two-thirds of their salaries after twenty years' service. 5. That a registrar intrusted with the discharge of judicial functions should not be permitted to practise either within his district or elsewhere. 6. That, in conformity with these recommendations, the Bill of the hon. member for Hull should be proceeded with. And the Committee have reported the Bills as follows:—County Courts Jurisdiction Bill (Mr. Norwood's) reported with amendments, and County Courts Procedure Bill (Mr. Rowley Hill's) and County Courts Jurisdiction (No. 2) Bill (Sir E. Wilmot's) without amendments.

A pamphlet reaches us from Sydney containing a report of a speech by Mr. Holt in the Legislative Council on the cruelty of compelling accused persons to stand in the dock during their trial. In his preface Mr. Holt says:—"During my residence in Paris in 1867-8, I was a frequent visitor at the Palais de Justice and the Tribunal of Commerce. I was accompanied by a French barrister, whose services I found very valuable in explaining to me the proceedings. With my English notions, I was much struck with the humanity shown to the accused on their trials. There is no dock, and the accused, however heinous their crime, are allowed to be seated during the trial, and never rise unless they wish to speak or are spoken to by the president. The benches on which the accused sit are precisely similar to those occupied by the jury, and directly in front of them. One or more policemen are always seated by the side of the prisoners. The English law presumes every man to be innocent until he has been found guilty, but this is not the practice in the British Colony of New South Wales. If a person is accused of a crime in this colony he is compelled to stand caged during his trial in what is called the 'dock,' and this degradation and pain are occasionally suffered by persons who have been maliciously or mistakenly accused, and who leave the court without a stain on their characters."

The *Times*' Indian correspondent telegraphs that a highly important and interesting question of constitutional law, as to the right of the Crown to cede Indian territory without the consent of Parliament, has been lately argued before the High Court of the North-West Provinces. Certain villages were ceded to the Nawab of Rampore for distinguished services rendered during the mutiny. The cession comprised 133 villages in the Bareilly district, and some others in the Moradabad district. The Nawab received possession, and from 1860 till the date of the present suit has been peaceably enjoying the domains. The cession was originally made by the Governor-General, and subsequently sanctioned by the Secretary of State for India. A suit was brought in 1876 before the High Court of Allahabad, to recover certain moneys due on a bond by which certain villages in the Rampore territory had been hypothecated. Defendant admitted the claim, but raised the plea of jurisdiction, contending that the villages in question had been ceded to Rampore and that the cession was valid *de facto* and *de jure*. The plaintiff admitted the cession but disputed its validity, on the ground

of its having been made *ultra vires*. The principal questions raised in the case were—(1) Has the Crown the power of ceding territory in any portion of its dominions without the consent of Parliament? and (2) has the Queen, as Empress of India, the power to make a cession of Indian territory on the ground of being the successor of the Emperors of Delhi? It was argued on behalf of the Government that the power to cede lands was an inherent prerogative of the Crown and not to be questioned by municipal courts. Many cases were cited, in which it was shown that the power of Parliament had never been evoked, except in one or two exceptional cases, like that of the revolted American colonies, and even in that instance, no actual authority was given by Parliament to cede lands. In all other cases cessions had been made directly by the Crown; the whole power of making contracts between England and foreign States resided in the Crown. In India, moreover, the successors of the Emperors of Hindostan had acquired rights quite different in nature from those existing in England. The Crown, by the charter of 1758, which granted the East India Company the right to cede, restore, or dispose of any fortresses, districts, or territories acquired by conquest from any Indian princes, or which should in future be acquired, had asserted a right to the absolute disposal of the lands. The right was never questioned. The present cession must, therefore, be taken as an act of the Crown itself, carried into effect by the instrumentality of responsible Ministers, and as such indisputably valid. After hearing full and elaborate arguments on both sides, the court reserved judgment.

Appointments, &c.

MR. GEO. MAULE ALLEN, solicitor of No. 17, Carlisle-street, Soho-square, has been appointed Clerk to the Commissioners of Taxes for the parish of Saint Anne, Westminster, in succession to Mr. John William Allen, who has retired from the office.

MR. GEORGE COGGINS, solicitor, of Deddington, has been appointed Deputy-Coroner for the Northern Division of Oxfordshire. Mr. Coggins was admitted a solicitor in 1871. His partner, Mr. Charles Duffell Faulkner, is coroner for the division.

SIR ADRIAN DINGLE, K.C.M.G., C.B., LL.D., Crown Advocate at Malta, has been commissioned to proceed to Cyprus to assist Major-General Sir Garnett Wolseley in organizing the Government of that island. Sir A. Dingle was born at Valetta. He was admitted to the bar at Malta in 1837, and was appointed Crown Advocate, legal adviser of the Government, and an *ex officio* member of the Council of the island in 1849. He was created a Civil Companion of the Order of the Bath in 1859, and a Knight Grand Cross of the Order of St. Michael and St. George in 1860.

MR. JOHN HOLLAMS, solicitor (of the firm of Hollams, Son, & Coward), Mincing-lane, has been elected President of the Incorporated Law Society for the ensuing year. Mr. Hollams was admitted a solicitor in 1844, and is in partnership with his son, Mr. John Hollams, jun., and with Mr. Cecil Allen Coward. He was a member of the Judicature Commission, and is now serving upon the Stock Exchange Commission.

MR. EDWARD PALMER LONDON, solicitor, of 16, New Broad-street and Brentwood, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the Acknowledgments of Deeds by Married Women for the Counties of Middlesex and Essex, and the Cities of London and Westminster.

MR. NATHANIEL TERTIUS LAWRENCE, solicitor (of the firm of Domville, Lawrence, Graham, & Long), has been elected Vice-President of the Incorporated Law Society for the ensuing year. Mr. Lawrence was admitted a solicitor in 1848. He is a director of the Solicitors' Benevolent Association, and solicitor to the Legal and General Life Assurance Society.

MR. CHARLES HENRY WATSON, solicitor, of Aylesbury, has been appointed Joint Registrar with his father, Mr. Henry Watson, of the Aylesbury County Court (Circuit, No. 37). Mr. C. H. Watson was admitted a solicitor in Trinity Term, 1861.

High Court of Justice.

QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

(Sittings at Nisi Prius, at Guildhall, before FIELD, J., and a Special Jury.)

July 17.—*Ditton v. Mason.*

This was an action for slander.

*Webster, Q.C., and Cock, appeared for the plaintiff.**Day, Q.C. (Candy with him), for the defendant.*

The plaintiff is a solicitor practising in London, and the defendant is a member of the firm of Andrews & Mason, accountants, of Ironmonger-lane, E.C. In March, 1877, one of the plaintiff's clients wished to purchase a business in Bermondsey, but not being himself possessed of sufficient capital, he had recourse to an advertisement in the *Times* to find some one to join him in the venture, and in this he was at once successful. The defendant, at the suggestion of the plaintiff, who was acting as solicitor in the matter, was called in to investigate the accounts. It was supposed at the time of the advertisement that the business was worth from £2,000 to £3,000 a year, but the defendant, after examining the books, furnished a report in which he stated the annual profits would be from £1,200 to £1,700. Some further investigation being considered necessary, he made a second report, in which he said that the profits would be something under £1,000 per annum if the figures in a stock-account book, which he had not previously seen, could be relied upon. He added that he considered these figures as of little or no value. The business was eventually purchased, and it soon became apparent that it was not a profitable one. An action was brought before the Master of the Rolls to set aside the sale, but it was unsuccessful. Shortly after this the defendant had spoken to one of the plaintiffs in this last-named action the slander now complained of. It was alleged that the defendant had said of the plaintiff,—“Mr. Ditton induced me to swear an affidavit that the profits were £1,200.” The plaintiff contended that these words meant that he had attempted to induce the plaintiff to make a false affidavit. The defendant denied that he meant to impute any impropriety of conduct to the plaintiff, and said that the words complained of merely related to an affidavit which the plaintiff had drawn for him as one of the witnesses in the action before the Master of the Rolls. Upon the plaintiff's case being closed, the statement of claim was amended by the substitution of the words “asked me to swear” for “endeavoured to induce me to swear.”

The learned JUDGE, in summing up, told the jury that they would probably merely have to decide whether or not the defendant intended to charge the plaintiff, by the words complained of, with an attempt to induce him to make a false affidavit, and, indeed, with subornation of perjury.

The jury, without leaving the box, answered this question in the negative, and thereupon

His LORDSHIP gave judgment for the defendant, certifying for a special jury.—*Times.*

DIVISIONAL COURT.

(Sittings in Banco, before KELLY, C.B., and MELLOR, J.)

July 16.—*In re David Erskine Forbes (a Solicitor).*

Murray moved on behalf of the Incorporated Law Society to make a rule (obtained on July 8) absolute to strike the defendant off the rolls, no cause being shown. The defendant, he said, had been co-executor and trustee of two sums of money—viz., £1,120 Indian debenture stock, and £4,000. By false pretences, it was alleged, he had obtained the first sum and appropriated the whole of it. As to the £4,000 he had acted in a similar way, and the money being in the account of the two trustees, he obtained the consent of his co-executor and signed a joint cheque. There was personal service on the 11th of July, and the defendant resided in London; but the learned counsel had reason to know no cause would be shown.

The COURT made the rule absolute.—*Times.*

County Courts.

LIVERPOOL.

(Before P. E. THOMPSON, Esq., Judge.)

July 2.—*Rees v. Shand, Higson, & Co.*

Evidence—Charter-party—Custom of the port.

By a charter-party entered into at Port Louis, Mauritius, between the plaintiff, the master of *The Granville*, and Messrs. Ireland, Fraser, & Co., it was agreed that the vessel should, when loaded, proceed “to a direct port in the United Kingdom, or direct to Cork or Falmouth for orders, to discharge at either a safe port in the United Kingdom, or on the Continent between Havre and Hamburg (both inclusive) as may be ordered on signing bills of lading”; and by the bill of lading the vessel was to call at Cork or Falmouth for orders, and to discharge as per charter-party. The cargo (sugar) was deliverable “to order or to assigns on paying freight for the said goods, and all other conditions as per charter-party.”

The ship ultimately discharged at Liverpool. When paying the freight, the defendants, who were assigns or indorsees of the bill of lading, and who carried on business at Liverpool, claimed a deduction, by an alleged custom of the port, of ninety-three days' interest at five per cent., which deduction the plaintiff declined to allow.

For this sum, amounting to £11 19s. 11d., he accordingly now sued.

For the plaintiff it was contended that evidence as to the alleged custom was inadmissible, first, because it would not simply add to, but contradict the contract, and, secondly, because the custom could not be considered as intended to form part of the contract. The contract implied immediate payment, the words being “on paying freight”: the custom, a deduction of interest, implied credit. And it was clear that the parties did not contemplate that the plaintiff should be bound by the custom, seeing that the port of Liverpool was not named; that there had been no previous dealings between the parties, and that the plaintiff resided at Swansea. The existence of the alleged custom was also disputed.

For the defendant reliance was placed on the case of *Brown v. Byrne* (3 E. & B. 703). In that case evidence had been admitted as to a similar custom of the same port with respect to ships coming from the United States, and the court had held generally that mercantile usages which might be supposed to be within the contemplation of the parties formed part of the contract.

For the plaintiff, in reply, it was pointed out that in the case cited both parties resided or carried on business at the port of discharge, and that port had been specially named in the contract; that in all the other cases in which such a custom had been allowed the port had been named; and that the general observations of the court as to the admission of mercantile usage were not intended to apply to such a case as the present, where the port was not named, where the plaintiff might have had to discharge anywhere in the United Kingdom or on the continent between Havre and Hamburg, where the plaintiff resided at such a distance as Swansea, and where no proof was given that the custom was known to him.

His HONOUR, however, ruled that evidence as to the custom was admissible, and after hearing this evidence considered the custom established. He thereupon decided that inasmuch as the port of discharge was included in the term “the United Kingdom,” and the plaintiff consequently knew that he might have to discharge at Liverpool, he must be taken to have intended that the custom should form part of the contract, and must therefore be bound by it. He could have easily have guarded against the deduction by inserting the words “without reduction,” or some similar words. The deduction, though for interest, was in reality nothing more than a discount or present payment. He therefore gave judgment for the defendants, with costs, with leave, however, to the plaintiff to appeal.

Legislation of the Week.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

JULY 11.—BILL READ A SECOND TIME.
FOREIGN JURISDICTION.

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Bournemouth Gas and Water, Cheltenham Corporation Water.

STATUTE LAW REVISION.

JULY 12.—BILLS PASSED THROUGH COMMITTEE.
INNKEEPERS. FOREIGN JURISDICTION.

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Dover and Deal Railway, Pontypridd, Caerphilly, and Newport Railway, Metropolitan Inner Circle Completion Railway.

JULY 15.—BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.

CHARITABLE TRUSTS. SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (OFFICERS).

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Lord Tredegar's Estate, Great Western and South Devon Railway Companies, Great Western Railway.

FOREIGN JURISDICTION.

JULY 16.—BILL READ A SECOND TIME.

PRIVATE BILL.—Bristol and Portishead Pier Railway (Portishead Docks).

BILL PASSED THROUGH COMMITTEE.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (OFFICERS).

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Rosebush and Fishguard Railway, Thames Conservancy.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

JULY 11.—BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Castleford and Whitwood Gas, Cromwell-road Bridge, Exeter Corporation Water.

JULY 12.—BILL READ A SECOND TIME.

POLICE EXPENSES ACT CONTINUANCE.

BILLS IN COMMITTEE.

HIGHWAYS (passed through committee). ADMIRALTY AND WAR OFFICE CLERKS (clauses 1 and 2).

BILL READ A THIRD TIME.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME.

METROPOLIS (FLOODS).—Bill to amend the Metropolis Management Act, 1875, and the Acts amending the same, so far as relates to the protection of the metropolis from floods and inundations caused by the overflow of the River Thames, and for other purposes. (Sir J. M'G. Hogg.)

JULY 15.—BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.

TURNPIKE ACTS CONTINUANCE. STATUTE LAW REVISION.

BILL READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILL.—Mansfield Commissioners Gas.

JULY 16.—BILL READ A SECOND TIME.

PRISON AUTHORITIES ACT AMENDMENT.

BILL PASSED THROUGH COMMITTEE.

ADMIRALTY AND WAR OFFICE (RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS).

BILL WITHDRAWN.

BREACH OF PROMISE OF MARRIAGE.

JULY 17.—BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Christchurch, Newgate-street, London, Tithes' Commutation, Cooke Estate, Marquis of Exeter's Settled Estates.

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS (MONEY).

BILLS IN COMMITTEE.

CATTLE DISEASES. POLICE EXPENSES ACT CONTINUANCE.

Law Student's Journal.

INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

FINAL EXAMINATION.

List of those gentlemen who passed the Final Examination in June last.*

Allen, C. A.	Eldridge, J. jun.
Anderson, J. T.	Ellis, A. J.
Ashwell, J. B.	Elsey, T. R.
Attwood, L. F.	Evans, F. A.
Avery, J.	Evill, W. E., B.A.
Baily, H. E.	Ewer, A. H. P.
Ball, R. F., B.A.	Farish, J.
Balshaw, J.	Farrell, T. F., B.A.
Barnes, R.	Farrington, W. F.
Barren, H.	Fenton, A. J.
Barrow, W. C.	Filder, C. P.
Bartrum, B. T., M.A., B.C.L.	Fisher, E. A. C.
Ratchelor, R. L.	Fletcher, A. H. J.
Bazalgette, H.	Flower, J., jun.
Beaumont, G. F.	Fowler, W. H.
Beck, F.	Francis, G. C.
Belk, H.	Francis, J. S.
Bell, C. R.	Francis, W.
Benorraft, T. A. R.	French, G. J.
Berridge, T. H. T.	Fuller, G.
Biden, L. M.	Gee, H. M.
Blackwell, R. R.	Godden, W. J.
Bowerbank, J. A.	Green, C. O.
Bramsdon, T. A.	Greenall, H.
Brenner, H.	Grigsby, D. D.
Briggs, A. H.	Hadley, S. C.
Broughton, R.	Halford, A. H.
Brown, D. H.	Hale, J. W.
Brown, F. W. F.	Hall, P. H.
Brown, G. F. S., B.A.	Hall, R.
Buckland, J. M.	Hamilton, F. de C.
Buckle, J., jun.	Hampson, G. H.
Buckmaster, C. J., B.A.	Hand, C. F., B.A.
Bulcock, H.	Hargrave, W.
Bullen, N. R. H.	Harper, C. H.
Burton, F. M., B.A.	Harrop, W.
Burton, G. W.	Hartley, H. R.
Butler-Bowden, J.	Harward, W. A.
Carpenter, R. H.	Haslam, J.
Cave, T., B.A.	Hayden, A. E.
Chambers, W. F.	Hayes, W., B.A.
Chapman, T. O.	Hearn, J. E.
Chapman, W. H.	Hemsley, A. E.
Cherry, F.	Heppell, J. T.
Chisholm, J. F. S.	Hincks, J. T.
Clayton, J.	Hinnell, C. R.
Collins, J. B.	Hopkins, J.
Cooke, W. H. A.	Horrocks, R. H.
Cooper, W. L.	Howse, F.
Cox, H. C.	Hoyle, G. C., B.A.
Crawshaw, J.	Hunt, S. L.
Cresswell, E. I.	Huntington, G. H.
Crosse, E. J.	Ivens, A. T.
Curry, J. V.	Jackson, E. A.
Daniel, J. H. D.	Jackson, T. C.
Davies, J. F.	Jebb, H. H., B.A.
Dawson, A.	Jellicorse, W. A.
Deakin, F., B.A.	Jennings, R.
Deakin, J. E.	Johns, F. A.
Dent, W. J.	Johnson, R. E.
Derham, A.	Jones, T. B., B.A.
Dickinson, H. S.	Jones, W. G. G.
Dickinson, J. L.	Jones, W. H.
Dobell, H.	Jones, W. J.
Dowding, A. C.	Kay, W. H.
Drayton, H. P. E.	Kemble, C.
Dutton, E.	Kerr, R. M.
Dyball, C. F. W.	Kerwood, A.
Eaton, G.	Kinder, F.
Eddison, O., B.A.	King, W. M.
Edwardes, D. C.	ingsford, C. E.
Eisdell, J. A.	isbey, H. E.

* This list, for which doubtless many of our readers were looking last week, reached us too late for publication.—[E.D. S. J.]

Laing, R. C.
 Lambert, S. E.
 Lane, J. H.
 Latham, H. W. L. B.
 Le Brasseur, H.
 Lewis, S. T., jun.
 Leyland, A.
 Lightbound, C. A.
 Lock, G. E.
 McLellan, W. J.
 Madden, W.
 Madge, H. W., B.A.
 Markham, J. W.
 Martin, P.
 Martinson, G.
 Mather, W. L.
 Matthews, C.
 Matthews, W. H.
 Mattinson, B. C.
 Maule, J. F.
 Mawson, J.
 Meadows, B. F.
 Mear, H.
 Mecoy, F.
 Melbush, T.
 Meredith, S. R., B.A.
 Merrills, J. M.
 Michell, E. L.
 Milne, J. H.
 Milner, H. T.
 Monkland, F. G.
 Mortimer, L. G., B.A.
 Moseley, M.
 Nadin, W. S.
 Nash, H. G.
 Need, W. G.
 Neve, A.
 Newman, A.
 Nicholls, J.
 Oliver J., jun.
 Ollard, J. A.
 Pamphilon, H. J. R.
 Parry, H. E.
 Peach, E. H., B.A.
 Pearce, A., B.A.
 Peter, T. C.
 Pinckney, J. H.
 Plews, H.
 Poole, H. W.
 Potts, R.
 France, C. T.
 Prickman, J. D.
 Proudfoot, A.
 Purvis, R., jun.
 Ramsay, J.
 Ramsden, W.
 Raper, A.
 Reed, E. L. H.
 Reeve, J. W.

Reynolds, G. H.
 Richards, R. S.
 Richardson, C. E.
 Ridley, L. C.
 Roberts, E. G.
 Roberts, J. R.
 Rogers, A., M.A.
 Rogers, A. T.
 Rose, A. H. P.
 Royle, G. E.
 Rudd, W.
 Rutter, J. K.
 Sandeman, S. L.
 Saw, S., jun.
 Severne, A. de M.
 Sharples, R.
 Sisson, R. F.
 Smallwood, H. W., B.A.
 Snape, J. J.
 Spearing, J.
 Spencer, T.
 Spink, G. H.
 Summerhays, W. F.
 Talbot, P. E. J.
 Taplin, W. H.
 Taylor, M.
 Taynton, H. J.
 Teather, W. E.
 Thomas, R. J.
 Thurman, H.
 Thurnam, W. D.
 Thursfield, A. S.
 Tilling, G.
 Trewhill, F. J.
 Underwood, C. C.
 Velling, H. A.*
 Vine, E. J.
 Waincoat, H.
 Waldron, C. R.
 Ward, E.
 Ward, H. E.
 Warner, L.
 Webb, M. R.
 Whittell, R. M.
 Wild, J. A., jun.
 Wild, W.
 Williams, A. E.
 Williams, F. V.
 Williams, R.
 Williamson, J. S.
 Wilson, A. M.
 Wilson, J. R.
 Woodley, W. A., jun.
 Woodward, B.
 Woodward, J. W.
 Woodwork, T. H., jun.
 Woosnam, C. W., B.A.
 Wright, J. J.
 Yerburch, E. R.

Court Papers.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	COUNT OF APPEAL.	MASTER OF THE ROLLS.	V.C. MALINS.
Monday, July..	22 Mr. Merivale	Mr. King	Mr. Clowes
Tuesday	23 Milne	Farrer	Koe
Wednesday....	24 Merivale	King	Clowes
Thursday	25 Milne	Farrer	Koe
Friday	26 Merivale	King	Clowes
Saturday	27 Milne	Farrer	Koe
	V. C. BACON.	V. C. HALL.	Mr. Justice Fry.
Monday, July..	22 Mr. Teesdale	Mr. Leach	Mr. Ward
Tuesday	23 Holdship	Latham	Pemberton
Wednesday....	24 Teesdale	Leach	Ward
Thursday	25 Holdship	Latham	Pemberton
Friday	26 Teesdale	Leach	Ward
Saturday	27 Holdship	Latham	Pemberton

SALES OF ENSUING WEEK.

July 24.—MESSRS. EDWIN FOX & BOUSFIELD, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., freehold and leasehold properties (see advertisement, p. 4, this week).
 July 24.—Mr. WALTER KNIGHT, at the Mart, at 1 p.m., freehold and leasehold properties, (see advertisement, p. 4, this week).
 July 26.—Messrs. FAREBROTHER, ELLIS, CLARK, & CO., at the Mart, at 2 p.m., freehold property (see advertisement, p. 11, June 1).
 July 26.—Messrs. PHILLIP D. TRICKETT & Co., at the Mart, at 2 p.m., freehold property (see advertisement, p. 4, July 13).

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

July 18, 1878.

RAILWAY STOCK.

	Railways.	Paid.	Closing Price.
Stock	Bristol and Exeter	100	—
Stock	Caledonian	100	111½
Stock	Glasgow and South-Western	100	90
Stock	Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	62
Stock	Great Northern	100	112
Stock	Do., A Stock*	100	108½
Stock	Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	129
Stock	Great Western—Original	100	102½
Stock	Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	134
Stock	London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	142
Stock	London, Chatham, and Dover	100	30
Stock	London and North-Western	100	147½
Stock	London and South-Western	100	134½
Stock	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	85
Stock	Metropolitan	100	119
Stock	Do., District	100	67½
Stock	Midland	100	127½
Stock	North British	100	93
Stock	North Eastern	100	145
Stock	North London	100	160
Stock	North Staffordshire	100	60
Stock	South Devon	100	70
Stock	South-Eastern	100	134

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

GORDON—July 14, at Cheam, the wife of Alexander Gordon, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.
 MARSHALL—July 11, at High Wycombe, Bucks, the wife of Thomas Marshall, solicitor, of a son.
 RIBTON—July 11, at 35, Elgin-road, Kensington-park, the wife of Theodore Ribton, barrister-at-law, of a son.
 YATES—July 13, the wife of Joseph Maghull Yates, barrister-at-law, of a son.

MARRIAGES.

COOKE—BEAUFAY—July 15, at St. Anne's, South Lambeth, Temple Ashwell Cooke, of the Middle Temple, barrister-at-law, to Margaretta, daughter of the late George Beaufay, of South Lambeth.
 COOPER—LORRIMER—July 10, at Leicester, Henry Stanley Cooper, solicitor, Manchester, to Rosina Frances Ellen, daughter of John Lorrimer, Leicester.
 JENKINS—TUCKER—July 16, at St. Gabriel's, Warwick-square, William Jenkins, barrister-at-law, of the Inner Temple, to Elizabeth Sibella, daughter of the late Rev. Comyns Tucker, of Beech Hill, Monchard Bishop.
 SHAW—SIMKINS—June 5, at Madras, Patrick Dunlop Shaw, of the Middle Temple, barrister-at-law, and Deputy-Coroner of Madras, to Ada, daughter of the late A. P. Simkins, of Calcutta.

DEATH.

FRANCE—July 8, at Frognal, Hampstead, Charles Henry France, barrister-at-law, aged 45.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

FRIDAY, July 12, 1878.

Herington, William Henry, and Norman Barron, Kingston-upon-Thames, Solicitors. July 5
 Wilson, William Radcliffe, and John William North, Wakefield, Solicitors. July 2

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, July 12, 1878.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Brighton Co-operative Stores, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented July 9, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins, on July 19. Newman, Draper's gardens, Throgmorton st., solicitor for the petitioners.

Victoria Coal and Iron Company (Swansea Vale) Limited.—Creditors are required on or before Aug 5, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts and claims to Frederick Joseph Tingle, Cannon st. Monday, Oct 28 at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

TUESDAY, July 16, 1878.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Automatic Girth Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented July 9, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall, on July 26. Kerly, Great Winchester st., solicitor for the petitioner.

Buxton Cement Company, Limited.—The M.R. has by an order dated June 5, appointed Edw. Guthrie, Marsden st., Manchester, to be official liquidator.

Crown Match Company, Limited.—The M.R. has by an order dated June 12, appointed William Henry Pannell, Guildhall chambers, to be official liquidator.

Flagstaff Silver Mining Company of Utah, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented July 12, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall, on July 26. Charlie and Co, Carter lane, solicitor for the petitioner.

Flagstaff Silver Mining Company of Utah, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented July 15, directed to be heard before the M.R. on July 27. Jennings, Leadenhall st., solicitor for the petitioner.

Oriental and American Telegram Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented July 10, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall on July 26. Carter, Old Jewry chambers, solicitor for the petitioner.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

TUESDAY, July 2, 1878.

Bartlett, Stephen, Belsize rd, St John's Wood, Drysalter. Aug 1. Burkhitt v. Bartlett, V.C. Hall. Hawes, Great Winchester st building.

Cross, Henry, Cambridge, Cook. Aug 2. Robinson v. Cross, M.R. Turner, Cambridge.

Dale, James John, Claremont villas, Upper Teddington, Aug 1. Dale v. Dale, V.C. Hall. Thompson, Gray's inn sq.

Hardy, John, the Edge, Durham, Coal Owner. July 22. Hardy v. Hardy, V.C. Bacon. Richardson, Barnard Castle.

Moore, Adam, Hanley, Stafford. Nov 1. Adams v. Dutton, V.C. Hall.

Sadler, Wilfrid, Church Hill, St Pancras, Tailor. Oct 28. Smith v. Smith, V.C. Bacon.

Sutton, William, Manchester, Provision Dealer. July 25. Thornhill v. Thornhill, M.R. Elliott, Manchester.

Swiney, Hugh Bladen, Peshawar, India, Captain 17th Bengal Cavalry. Oct 29. Rowe v. Swiney, M.R. Chaplain, Lincoln's inn fields.

White, Miles, Ulverston, Brewer. July 31. Higgin v. White, V.C. Malins. Wheeler, Queen Victoria st.

FRIDAY, July 5, 1878.

England, George, New Cross, Engineer. Aug 1. England v. Thompson, V.C. Hall. Horsley, Staple inn.

Gould, Rev George, Crosswell Bishop, Notts. July 26. Gould v. Smith, V.C. Malins. Burton, Nottingham.

Hoare, Peter Richard, Linscombe, Devon, Banker. Aug 16. Hoare v. Strickland, M.R. Tylee and Co, Essex st, Strand.

Johnson, William, Stalybridge, Cheshire, Cotton Manufacturer. July 26. Johnson v. Leigh, V.C. Malins. Taylor, Stalybridge.

Jordison, Christopher, Lockington, York Farmer. July 30. Jordison v. Jordison, V.C. Hall. Robinson, Beverley.

Kingdon, Rev Roger George, Plymouth. Oct 1. Martin v. Cowlard, V.C. Bacon. Cowlard, Lincoln's inn fields.

Lyon, John Bainbridge, Canning place, Hyde park, Stockbroker. July 30. Roberts v. Gorway, V.C. Hall. Thomson and Co, Road lane.

Metzgar, Henry John, Forest Hill, Merchant. Oct 31. Metzgar v. Metzgar, V.C. Malins. Morris, Basinghall st.

Minors, John, Eaton, Derby, Farmer. July 26. Mynors v. Mynors, V.C. Hall. Darnett, Uttoxeter.

Muller, Henry Charles, Northampton sq, Furrier. Aug 1. Muller v. Muller, V.C. Hall. Foster, Birch lane.

Prinsep, Charles Robert, Burbiton, Surrey. Dec 6. Prinsep v. Prinsep, V.C. Bacon. Denborough and Son, Finsbury place South.

Ross, Mary, Albion sq, Dalton. July 31. Guion v. Guion, V.C. Bacon. Russel, Coleman st.

Tyson, Jane, Epsom, Surrey. Aug 1. Dale v. Legg, V.C. Hall. Bridger and Collins, King William st.

Watson, William, Woodhouse, York, Farmer. Aug 3. Watson v. Watson, V.C. Hall. Reed, Kingston-upon-Hull.

Wood, John, Boston, Auctioneer. Aug 3. Smith v. Wood, V.C. Hall. Millington, Boston.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

TUESDAY, July 9, 1878.

Anderson, Mary Dent, Camden Hill rd, Kensington. Sept 15. Fielder, Godliman st, Doctor's commons.

Armitage, James, Leeds, Cloth Finisher. Oct 26. Dunning and Kay, Leeds.

Austen, James, Ramsgate, Brower. Oct 11. Daniel, Ramsgate.

Baker, Eliza, Cambridge, Baker. Sept 30. Whitehead, Cambridge.

Butcher, Henry Frederick, Easton, Wilts, Gent. Aug 1. Dixon, Pewsey.

Carey, Caroline, Pont st, Belgrave. Aug 19. Parker and Co, St Paul's churchyard.

Catchpool, Thomas, Colchester, Ironmonger. Aug 17. Wittey, Colchester.

Cleaver, Robert Bath, Egloshayle, Cornwall, Accountant. Aug 8. Symonds, Wadebridge.

Cress, James, Ancoats, Manchester, Publican. Aug 3. Grundy and Co, Manchester.

Dunsantoy, Alfred, Petersfield, Hants, Gent. July 25. Marvin, South-

Ealen, Thomas, Daventry, Northampton, Auctioneer. Aug 17. Barton and Willoughby, Daventry.

Farrell, Marie Frances, Liverpool. July 20. Wright and Co, Liverpool.

Ferguson, Isabella, South Shields, Durham. Aug 1. Osborns, South Shields.

Glanville, William, Doncaster, Gent. Aug 1. Collinson and Co, Doncaster.

Goulding, William, New End, Hampstead, Licensed Victualler. Aug 19. Saxton and Morgan, Somerset st, Portman sq.

Hanson, Joseph, Clapham Common, Esq. Aug 31. Pattison and Co, Queen Victoria st.

Hoey, William Henry, Southend, Gent. Sept 1. Green and Chace, Warwick st, Charing Cross.

Hyland, Christopher, Longsight, nr Manchester, Drysalter. Sept 10. Sale and Co, Manchester.

Jolly, William Richardson, Sale, Cheshire, Esq. Sept 10. Stevens and Harries, Coleman st.

Leader, Job, sen, Poole, Dorset, Builder. Aug 8. Aldridge and Aldridge, Bury.

Lury, John Elton, Southampton, Corn Merchant. Sept 1. Brady and Co, Southampton.

Mallett, Henry Samuel, Liverpool, Travelling Agent. Aug 8. Yate and Co, Liverpool.

Manby, John, Skipton, York, Gent. Aug 12. Robinson, Skipton.

Montgomery, Isabella Anne, Brunswick rd, Brighton. Aug 19. Le and Co, Broad Sanctuary.

Mott, Edward Richard, Fortsea, Gent. Aug 12. Robinson, Gresham House, Old Broad st.

Pollard, Thomas, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Merchant. Aug 16. Harb, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Pratt, Mary Louisa, Chester sq. Aug 5. Bircham and Co, Parliament st.

Puckford, James, Plymouth, Captain R.N. Oct 10. Rooker and Co, Plymouth.

Russell, Margaret, Nether Heworth Hall, Durham. Oct 5. Fowler and Co, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Sammutt, Giuseppe, Casal Balsan, Malta, Merchant. Aug 10. Agius, East India chambers, Leadenhall st.

Shaw, Henry, Bury, Lancashire, Farmer. Aug 5. Grundy and Co, Bury.

Shewell, Edward Warner, Cheltenham, Esq. Oct 3. Winterbotham and Co, Cheltenham.

Shuttleworth, John, Harden, York, Farmer. Aug 12. Robinson, Skipton.

Smith, Thomas, Easton, Wilts, Grocer. Aug 1. Dixon, Pewsey.

Starns, Henry Joseph, Chard, Somerset, Accountant. Aug 23. Dummett and Canning, Chard.

Swan, Joseph, Morpeth, Northumberland, Esq. Aug 16. Harle, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Taylor, Ann Aveline, Torquay. Aug 17. Bowerman, Gray's inn square.

Tewksbury, William, Maids vale, Engineers' Manager. Aug 1. McClellan, Bedford row.

Watton, John Edward, Pershore, Worcester, Hotel Proprietor. July 31. Martin, Pershore.

Whitmore, James, Fentiman rd, Kennington, out of business. Aug 11. Drake and Son, Cloak lane, Cannon st.

Wyatt, Ann Diana, North hill, Highgate. Aug 10. Wright, Welbrook.

Yates, Elizabeth, Habergham, nr Burnley. Aug 3. Backhouse, Burnley.

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, July 12, 1878.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar

To Surrender in London.

Redmond, William Archer, Warwick st, Pimlico, Gent. Pet July 3. Brougham. July 26 at 11.

To Surrender in the Country.

Darlington, Joseph, Harehill, Stafford, Commercial Traveller. Pet July 8. Keary, Stoke-upon-Trent, July 23 at 3.

Farrell, James, Fittleworth, Sussex. Pet July 5. Evershed, Brighton Aug 9 at 11.

Hall, Joseph, Fenton, Stafford, Blacksmith. Pet July 9. Keary, Stoke-upon-Trent, July 23 at 3.30.

Mason, Alfred, Bradford, York, Advertising Agent. Pet July 8. Robinson, Bradford, July 23 at 9.

Peirs, William, Bishop Auckland, Auctioneer. Pet July 8. Marshall, Durham, July 23 at 11.

Stutcliffe, Thomas, Windhill, nr Shipley, Builder. Pet July 10. Robinson, Bradford, July 26 at 9.

Terrell, Thomas Hall, Ranelagh rd, Ealing, Gent. Pet July 8. Ruston, Brentford, July 30 at 3.

Thornton, Joseph, Ravenstone, Leicestershire, Colliery Proprietor. Pet July 3. Hubberty, Burton-upon-Trent, Aug 7 at 1.30.

Wigley, William Gwyther, John Groomer Kimpton, and Daniel Whitehouse, Birmingham, Merchants. Pet July 9. Farry, Birmingham, July 26 at 8.

Wood, George Alfred, Elmley Lovett, Worcester, out of business. Pet July 5. Crisp, Worcester, July 23 at 12.

TUESDAY, July 16, 1878.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar

To Surrender in London.

Feast, Robert Walton, Abchurch lane, Auctioneer. Pet July 13. Brougham. Aug 2 at 11.

To Surrender in the Country.

Dennison, John, Swansea, Tallow Chandler. Pet July 12. Jones, Swansea, July 30 at 12.

Gordon, Cecil Grosble, Gloucester House, Ashford, no occupation. Pet July 12. Bell, Kingston, July 25 at 4.

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, July 12, 1878.

Bell, James George, Blackheath, Wine Merchant. July 10.

Waring, Charles H., Bath, Gent. May 23.

TUESDAY, July 16, 1878.

Haynes, William Clarke, Castle Hill, Maidhead. July 11
 Thomas, Benjamin, Windhill, York, Spirit Merchant. July 12
 Trafford, William, Leek, Stafford, Silk Manufacturer. July 11

Liquidations by Arrangement. FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

Friday, July 12, 1878.

Alcock, William Hardy, Foleahill, Warwick, Grocer. July 29 at 11 at offices of Goate, Priory road, Coventry
 Austin, Peter, Wolverhampton, out of business. Aug 3 at 11 at offices of Rhodes, Queen st, Wolverhampton
 Bairstow, James Oates, Huddersfield, Woollen Cloth Merchant. July 26 at 11 at the warehouse of Bairstow, St John's rd, Huddersfield.
 Berry, Huddersfield.
 Ball, Robert, Bristol, Butcher. July 24 at 12 at offices of Meeres, Nicholas st, Bristol
 Bentham, William, Chorley, Lancashire, Grocer. July 24 at 11 at offices of Morris, Townhall chambers, Chorley
 Berry, George, and Edward Berry, Ashford, Kent, Coal Merchants. July 23 at 3 at 27, High st, Ashford. Norwood, Charing
 Blakley, John Thomas, Oswaltwistle, Lancashire, Builder. July 24 at 11 at offices of Marriott, Northgate, Blackburn
 Branch, Joseph, Lockwood, nr Huddersfield, Innkeeper. July 24 at 11 at offices of Bottomley, New st, Huddersfield
 Brearley, Robert, Watford, Lancashire, Smallware Dealer. July 26 at 3 at the Mitre Hotel, Manchester. Toy and Broadbent, Ashton-under-Lyne
 Broughton, Samuel, Bridgnorth, Salop, Licensed Victualler. July 29 at 12.30 at the Swan Hotel, High st, Bridgnorth. Haslewood, Bridgnorth
 Brown, Joseph Calverley, Haverham Eaves, Lancashire, Innkeeper. July 25 at 3 at offices of Nowell, Hargreaves st, Burnley
 Bullivant, Joseph, and Samuel Bullivant, Nottingham, Basket Makers. Aug 3 at 12 at offices of Williams, jun, Poultry arcade, Nottingham
 Burrell, George Eldon, Aylsham, Norfolk, Wine Merchant. July 26 at 11 at offices of Scott, Aylsham
 Caimhead, Robert, Size lane, Merchant. July 29 at 12 at offices of Edwards and Co, King st, Cheapside
 Calvert, Charles Henry, Kingston-upon-Hull, Pilosagins Manufacturer. July 26 at 12 at offices of Chatham and Son, Bowllalley lane, Kingston-upon-Hull
 Carr, John Deighton, Hunslet, nr Leeds, Chemical Manufacturer. July 26 at 2 at offices of North and Sons, East parade, Leeds
 Cavanagh, William James, Wandsworth rd, Surrey, Dealer in Unredeemed Bonds. July 29 at 3 at offices of Cooper, Chancery lane
 Chamings, Thomas, Swansea, Corn Merchant. July 23 at 3 at offices of Glascoine, Fisher st, Swansea
 Clayton, George, Woolwich, Coal Merchant. July 23 at 12 at offices of Waring, Borough, Southwark
 Cooper, Timothy Wilson, Kendal, Westmorland, Draper. July 29 at 11 at the Board Room, Market place, Kendal. Thomson and Wilson, Kendal
 Craig, Francis Dobson, South Shields, Coal Merchant. July 23 at 3 at offices of Rennoldson, King st, South Shields
 Curtis, Robert, Ainsley, York, Builder. July 24 at 3 at offices of Bekering, Parliament st, Kingston-upon-Hull. Summers, Hull
 Davis, Charles, Wigan, Lancashire, Engineer. July 25 at 11 at offices of Lees, King street, Wigan
 Davidson, Andrew, Cambridge place, Paddington, Fancy Dealer. July 24 at 12 at 282, Marylebone road
 Donlan, James, and Thomas Williams, Manchester, Joiners. July 26 at 3 at the Mitre Hotel, Cathedral yard, Manchester. Cobbett & Co, Manchester
 Duffy, John, Liverpool, Glass and China Dealer. July 29 at 2 at offices of Pemberton & Co, Harrington street, Liverpool
 Evans, Thomas, Gelfa Mawr, Denbigh, Grocer. July 25 at 3 at offices of Sherratt, Market street, Wrexham
 Evans, Thomas, Cae-gwy, Flint, Timber Merchant. July 24 at 12 at the Lion Hotel, Hope street, Wrexham. Lewis, Yppty, Wrexham
 Fay, Owen, West Hartlepool, Durham, Grocer. July 25 at 11 at offices of Wilson, Church street, West Hartlepool
 Fielder, Charles, and Henry James Cole, York street, Lambeth, Engineers. July 26 at 3 at offices of Waring, Borough, Southwark
 Fleck, Thomas, Bideford, Devon, Draper. July 23 at 12 at offices of Thorne, Castle street, Barnstable
 Ford, Thomas Huggins, Bourke road, Wood Green, Builder. Aug 1 at 2 at offices of Davis, Moorgate street
 French, Alfred, Bradford, Brass Founder. July 25 at 4 at offices of Atkinson, Tyrell street, Bradford
 Gamble, John, Stockport, Auctioneer. July 23 at 3 at offices of Lambert, Princess street, Manchester
 Gaskell, Joseph, Hulme, Manchester, Grocer. July 25 at 3 at offices of Tidwell, Brzenose street, Manchester
 Gibbs, John, Wells street, Hackney, Furniture Dealer. July 23 at 3 at offices of Taylor & Jaquet, South street, Finsbury square
 Gordon, George, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Cabinet Maker. July 25 at 1 at offices of Clark, Granger street West, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Gregory, Alfred, John, Batley, Painter. July 30 at 11 at offices of Shaw, Bond street, Dewsbury
 Griffiths, Thomas, junior, Llanelly, Carmarthen, Confectioner. July 30 at 11 at offices of Johnson & Stead, Llanelly
 Guillaume, Victor Pierre, Coventry, Watch Material Dealer. July 24 at 3 at the Castle Hotel, Broad gate, Coventry. Minister, Coventry
 Hainsshaw, Tom, Scarborough, Provision Dealer. July 25 at 2 at Abbot's Hotel, York. Watts, Scarborough
 Handy, Sarah, Newport, Monmouth, Furniture Dealer. July 26 at 12 at the Grand Hotel, Broad street, Bristol. Lloyd, Newport
 Harden, William Henry, Fuddeston, Herefordshire, Miller. July 23 at 10.30 at the Tabbot Hotel, Leominster. Corner, Hereford
 Harding, Louisa, Bristol, out of business. July 27 at 10 at offices of Triggs, Broad street, Bristol. Bowles, Bristol
 Hardy, Joseph, Hunslet, Leeds, Soap Agent. July 25 at 3 at Wharton's Hotel, Park lane, Leeds. Watson, Leeds
 Harrison, Rowland, Winstan, Durham, Licensed Victualler. July 24 at 11 at offices of Bush, St Nicholas buildings, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Hart, Christopher Foster, and Wilson Wales, Darlington, Grocers. July 26 at 11 at the Wholesale Traders' Association, 116, High st, Stockton-on-Tees
 Hicks, Thomas, Brockton, Salop, Butcher. July 25 at 11 at the White Horse Inn, Wrexham. Morris, Shrewsbury
 Holden, John, Thurley, Surrey, Licensed Victualler. July 27 at 12 at offices of Geach, Woodbridge rd, Guildford
 How, John, Cambridge rd, Mile end, Chandler. July 27 at 3 at offices of Biggendon, Well st, Ware st, Hackney
 Howard, Thomas, Liverpool, Painter. July 29 at 3 at offices of Lawrence and Co, Lord st, Liverpool
 Irish, Henry, Lowestoft, Snack Owner. July 29 at 12 at offices of Soago, High st, Lowestoft
 Jacob, Simon, Towcester, Northampton, Tailor. Aug 2 at 12 at the Talbot Hotel, Towcester. Whitton, Towcester
 Jobson, John Thomas, Gateshead, Builder. July 29 at 11 at offices of Elsdon, Royal arcade, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Knapton, Meshach, Vauxal rd, Brixton, Biscuit Baker. July 24 at 3 at Muller's Hotel, Ironmonger lane. King, Walbrook
 Law, John William, Wigan, Grocer. July 25 at 3 at offices of Scotland, Ellis, The Arcade, King st, Wigan
 Lawrence, David, Jamaica rd, Bermondsey, Furniture Dealer. July 18 at 4 at 19, Worship st, Finsbury. Fenton, Highgate
 Leat, John Greenslade, St George, Gloucester, Baker. July 26 at 3 at offices of Clifton, Broad st, Bristol
 Lee, Alfred, John, Stoke, nr Deynport, Baker. July 25 at 1 at offices of Cartea, St George's Hall, East Stonehouse
 De Leeuw, Solomon, Aldgate High st, Carcase Butcher. July 19 at 2 at offices of Jones, Bruton st, Bond st
 Lewitt, Alfred, Leicester, Fishmonger. July 26 at 3 at offices of Loseby and Bruton, Market st, Leicester
 Macaulay, Aeneas, Middleton-in-Tee-dale, Durham, Medical Practitioner. July 22 at 3 at the Witham Testimonial, Barnard Castle
 Mackness, Howard Hinton, Bate Docks, Cardiff, Grocer. July 29 at 3 at the Bell Hotel, Southgate st, Gloucester. Hill, Cardiff
 Miller, Henry, Birmingham, Lamp Manufacturer. July 29 at 11 at offices of Spencer, Bennett's hill, Birmingham
 Mobberley, Elizabeth Sarah, Oldswinford, Worcester, Licensed Victualler. July 26 at 2 at offices of Ohmer, High st, Brerley hill
 Moore, Edward Charles, Outram rd, Croydon, out of business. July 22 at 11.30 at offices of Jackson and Prince, Clement's lane, Lombard st
 Moreland, Ebenezer Bell, and Thomas Wolstencroft Booth, Fitchett's court, Noble st, Collar Manufacturers. July 24 at 3 at offices of Nazar, Castle st, Holborn
 Nelham, Carloline, Hill st, Richmond, Locksmith. July 24 at 2 at 111, Cheapside. Clift
 Nicholson, Robert Hedley, and Joseph Nicholson, Sunderland, Builders. July 28 at 11 at offices of Skinner, John st, Sunderland
 Oldham, William, Swansea, Builder. July 23 at 11 at 1, Worcester-place, Swansea. Brown and Co
 Orizon, Joseph, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Jeweller. July 25 at 12 at the Incorporated Law Society, Royal-arcade, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Gibsons and Pybus, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Ormond, Henry, Bourn, Lincoln, Auctioneer. July 24 at 11 at offices of Law, St Mary's place, Stamford
 Park, Agnes, Wigan, Bookseller. July 25 at 11 at offices of Franco, Church gate, Wigan
 Parsons, John Strafford, Cirencester, Coal Merchant. July 24 at 11 at the Ram Public Room, Castle st, Cirencester. Mullings and Co, Cirencester
 Peace, Henry, Winchester, Gilder. July 26 at 2 at Winchester. Adams & Co
 Pinching, Samuel, Wordsley, Stafford, Miller's Foreman. July 23 at 3 at offices of Homfray and Holberton, High st, Brerley hill
 Poole, jun, John, Mark lane, Auctioneer. July 18 at 3 at offices of Grueber, Railway approach, London Bridge
 Pratt, Richard, Fenton, Stafford, House Painter. July 24 at 11 at 23, Commerce st, Longditch. Adley and Mardest
 Prosser, Alfred Robert, Sheffield, out of business. July 24 at 11 at the Outlers' Hall, Church st, Sheffield. Rodgers and Co, Sheffield
 Pringle, James Gwilliam, Walker, Northumberland, Provision Dealer. July 22 at 2 at offices of Sewell, Grey st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Radcliffe, Thomas, Warley, York, Licensed Victualler. July 22 at 11 at the Brown Cow Hotel, Halifax. Leeming, Halifax
 Randel, Edward, Birmingham, Silversmith. July 25 at 11 at offices of Jeffery Parr, Colmore row, Birmingham
 Ribby, Thomas William, and William Lovell, Liverpool, Printers. July 29 at 2 at offices of Sheen and Broadhurst, North John st, Liverpool. Geo, Liverpool
 Russell, John, West Marden, Sussex, Blacksmith. August 6 at 3 at the Crown Hotel, Emsworth. Arnold, Chichester
 Schotfield, John, Sheffield, Plumber. July 25 at 2 at offices of Fairburn, Bank st, Sheffield
 Shelmerdine, Albert, Rusholme, Lancaster, Licensed Victualler. July 23 at 3 at offices of Edwards, Brzenose street, Manchester
 Shipley, George Warner, Jamaica rd, Bermondsey, Ironmonger. July 25 at 3 at offices of Parkes, Queen Victoria st
 Simpson, Thomas, and Thomas Conithard, Warwick st, Pimlico, Builders. July 26 at 12 at the Law Institution, Chancery lane
 Roberts, Clement's Inn, Strand
 Singleton, Thomas, Newton with Scales, Lancaster, Farmer. July 26 at 3 at offices of Blackhurst, Fox st, Preston
 Sketch, Henry Bolt, Cwmbran, Monmouth, Builder. July 29 at 12 at offices of Tribe & Co, High street, Newport. Gibbs & Llewellyn, Newport
 Smart, William, St George, Gloucester, Butcher. July 19 at 11 at offices of Pitt, Nicholas street, Bristol
 Smith, George, junior, and Frederick Smith, New Park road, Brixton, Builders. July 24 at 1 at offices of Reader, Gray's inn square
 Smith, George Foster, Bradford, Coal Merchant. July 19 at 11 at offices of Terry & Robinson, Market street, Bradford
 Smith, Peter, Union road, Borough, Lamp Manufacturer. July 24 at 12 at offices of Langton, Queen Victoria street
 Somers, Lawrence Abraham, Tottenham court road, Dealer in Oleographs. July 19 at 3 at the Mason's Hall Tavern, Mason's avenue Basinghall street. Crozier, King William street

Speake, Joseph, Milnrow, Lancashire, Builder. July 26 at 3 at offices of Ashworth, Yorkshire street, Rochdale
 Stanford, Samuel Lambert, and Alfred Hand, Rowley Regis, Staffordshire, Tube Manufacturers. July 25 at 12 at the Dudley Arms Hotel, Market place, Dudley. Jackson, West Bromwich
 Stopford, Joseph, Skelmersdale, Lancashire, Boot Maker. July 25 at 11 at offices of Stuart, King street, Wigan
 Storer, Henry, Wilkes street, Spitalfields, Draper. July 20 at 10.30 at 8, North buildings, Eldon street, Finsbury. Dobson, Duke street, Aldgate
 Strachan, Alexander, Sunderland, Hatter. July 25 at 11 at offices of Bond, Grainger street West, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Straker, James, Wick, Gloucestershire, Licensed Victualler. July 25 at 1 at offices of Fox & Whitlock, Corn street, Bristol
 Tennent, John, Bell street, Edgware road, Picture Dealer. July 22 at 11 at offices of Treherne & Wolferstan, Ironmonger lane
 Thompson, Thomas William, Regent's road, Dalston, Cabinet Manufacturer. July 24 at 2 at offices of Lee, Old Jewry chambers
 Tozer, William Henry, Exeter street, Chelsea, Printer. July 20 at 2 at offices of George, Finsbury place
 Trout, Ridgill Womersley, Bradford, Commission Agent. July 25 at 11 at offices of Gardiner & Jeffery, Bond street, Bradford
 Tymms, Sarah Ann, Leeds, Beerhouse Keeper. July 27 at 11.30 at offices of Hanson, Corn Exchange, Leeds. Dresser, Leeds
 Wardroper, Anthony John, South Boldon, Durham, Builders' Merchant. July 24 at 3 at offices of Alcock, Frederick Lodge, Sunderland
 Watson, William, Liverpool, Fruit Dealer. July 26 at 3 at offices of Connor, Victoria street, Liverpool. Norton & Mason, Liverpool
 White, William Bell, Birkenhead, Commercial Traveller. Aug 1 at 2 at 6 Duncan street, Birkenhead. Hannan & Pugh
 Wilding, George, Chester, Publican. July 26 at 3 at offices of Ellis, Eastgate street, Chester
 Wilkinson, Daniel, Southampton, Builder. July 30 at 12 at the Incorporated Law Society's Rooms, Cook street, Liverpool Walton & Smith, Southampton
 Williams, Elijah, Crossway, Herefordshire, Threshing Machine Proprietor. July 25 at 10.30 at offices of Corner, High Town, Hereford
 Will, George, Bourne mouth, Builder. July 26 at 2 at offices of Aldridge & Sharp, Westover viles, Bournemouth
 Woolf, Henry, Sun street, Finsbury, Job Draper. July 22 at 2 at offices of Barnett, Palmerston buildings, Old Broad street

TUESDAY, July 16, 1878.

Ainge, William Ely, Halifax, Accountant's Clerk. July 26 at 11 at offices of Foster and England, Townhall chambers, Halifax
 Alexander, Elias, and Philip Alexander, Liverpool, Wholesale Tobacconists. Aug 2 at 2 at offices of Norton and Mason, Victoria st, Liverpool
 Andrew, Richard, Middleton, Lancashire, Bleacher. Aug 8 at 3 at offices of Boote and Edgar, Booth st, Manchester
 Bagge, Henry James, and Charles Beaumont, Queen Victoria st, Timber Merchants. July 26 at 2 at offices of Morgan and Co, Coleman st
 Bailey, William Joseph, Quedgey, Gloucester, out of business. July 27 at 12 at offices of Cooke, Berkeley st, Gloucester
 Baker, James, Skelmersdale, Lancashire, Potato Dealer. Aug 3 at 11 at offices of Lees, King st, Wigan
 Baker, John George, Merthyr Tydfil, Victualler. July 27 at 3 at offices of Beddoe, Victoria st, Merthyr Tydfil
 Beardall, Henry, Blackburn, Brassfounder. July 30 at 3 at offices of Brothers, Exchange Flags, Blackburn
 Bentley, John, Altrincham, Cheshire, Builder. July 30 at 3 at offices of Simpson and Hokin, Mount st, Manchester
 Billyeald, Alfred, Nottingham, Jeweller. Aug 1 at 11 at offices of Burton and Co, Long row, Market place, Nottingham
 Binnie, Robert, York, Cab Proprietor. Aug 3 at 1 at offices of Mann and Son, New st, York
 Boyd, John Frederick, Leicester, Cigar Manufacturer. July 29 at 4 at offices of Acton, Victoria st, Nottingham
 Brearley, William, Robert Moore, and John Cookcroft, New Bank, Halifax, Machinists. July 29 at 11 at offices of Longbottom, Northgate chambers, Halifax
 Bri-bane, James Duncan, Doncaster, Accountant. Aug 6 at 2.30 at the Reindeer Hotel, Doncaster. Rideal, Barnsley
 Buckworth, Rowland, Fletton, Huntingdon, Cattle Dealer. July 29 at 2 at offices of Law, St Mary's place, Stamford
 Carr, Charles McDowell, Mill Dam, Pontefract, out of business. July 29 at 3 at the Crown and Anchor Inn, Beest Fair, Pontefract. Lodge, Wakefield
 Carr, James, Leeds, Drysalter. July 29 at 3 at offices of Pullan, Bank chambers, Park row, Leeds
 Carr, John Duggett, Gateshead, Grocer. July 29 at 2 at offices of Elmgre, Grainger st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Cavill, Charles William, Harwich, Coal Merchant. July 27 at 2 at offices of Peacock, St Peter's st, Ipswich
 Charlton, James Bewick, Manchester, Grocer. July 29 at 3 at offices of Addeshaw and Warburton, Norfolk st, Manchester
 Clough, Benjamin, Moor Side, nr Bradford, Dealer in Sausage Skins. July 31 at 10 at offices of Peel and Gaunt, Chapel lane, Bradford
 Collins, James Robert, Kennington Cross, Refreshment Contractor. July 24 at 3 at offices of Barnard and Co, Finsbury place
 Cox, Silvanus, and John Cox, Walsall, Steam Pipe Fitters. July 26 at 11 at offices of Dugman and Co, the Bridge, Walsall
 Cox, Thomas, Cambridge, Tobacconist. July 25 at 2 at offices of Ginn, Alexandra st, Cambridge
 Crane, Alexander, Pontnewynydd, Mon, Provision Merchant. July 30 at 12 at offices of Dauncey, Abdon chambers, Commercial st, Newport
 Crawshaw, Samuel, Sheffield, Builder. July 26 at 10 at offices of Forrester, Bank st, Sheffield
 Crossland, William, Halifax, Farmer. July 29 at 4 at offices of Storey, King Cross st, Halifax
 Curtis, Edward Harry, Albany rd, Camberwell, Insurance Agent. July 29 at 2 at offices of Morphet and Hanson, Champside. Pettiver, College st, College hill
 Dewey, Charles, Birmingham, Provision Dealer. July 30 at 11 at offices of Davies, Bennett's hill, Birmingham

Dingwall, William, Goole, York, Tailor. July 27 at 11 at offices of Pease, Bank's terrace, Goole. Hind, Goole
 Dodgson, Robert, Wakefield, Cabinet Maker. July 27 at 11 at offices of Taylor, Wood st, Wakefield
 Doughty, John Edward, Willenhall, Grocer. Aug 3 at 11 at offices of Stratton and Radland, Queen st, Wolverhampton
 Doulan, James, and Thomas Williams, Manchester, Joiners. July 25 at 3.30 at the Mitre Hotel, Cathedral yard, Manchester. Cobbett and Co, Manchester
 Evans, William, Merthyr Tydfil, Grocer. July 27 at 11 at offices of Beddoe, Victoria st, Merthyr Tydfil
 Foden, Thomas, Manchester, Chemist. July 29 at 3 at offices of Withington and Co, Brown st, Manchester
 Forrester, Frank, Gloucester, Printer. July 22 at 3 at offices of Haines, St John's lane, Gloucester
 Fry, John Burgess, Redcliff, Bristol, Haulier. July 26 at 12 at offices of Benson, Broad st, Bristol
 Garrett, Richard, Bath, Ironmonger. July 29 at 1 at the George Railway Hotel, Victoria st, Bristol. Simmons and Clark, Bath
 Geldard, Ralph Booth, Tudhoe Grange, nr Spennymoor, Iron Founder. July 25 at 3 at offices of Proud, Market place, Bishop Auckland
 Gibbs, John Floyd, Buckingham Palace rd, Marble Merchant. July 29 at 11 at the Cannon st Station Hotel. Pettiver, College st, College hill
 Gibbs, Mary Ann, Smethwick, Stafford, Furniture Dealer. July 26 at 11 at offices of Shakespeare, Church st, Oldbury
 Glenister, Joseph George, Newcastle place, Edgware rd, Coach Builder. Aug 3 at 1 at offices of York, Marybone rd
 Goodall, John, Manchester, Timber Merchant. July 24 at 3 at offices of Sale and Co, Booth st, Manchester
 Gregory, Matthew, jun, Chesterfield, Butcher. July 27 at 3 at offices of Gee, High st, Chesterfield
 Hall, Albert Edwin, Heeley, York, Book Keeper. July 24 at 12 at offices of Pierson, Queen st, Sheffield
 Harper, Elizabeth Annie, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Lodging House Keeper. July 26 at 2 at offices of Sewell, Grey st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Harrington, Thomas Francis, Colchester, Horse Dealer. July 29 at 3 at offices of Jennings, Church st, Colchester
 Hawkrige, William, Robert, Robert st, Limehouse, Grocer. Aug 5 at 4 at offices of Birchall, Cowper's court, Cornhill
 Henderson, Robert, and Joshua Wright, Leeds, Grocers. July 26 at 11 at offices of Hewson, East parade, Leeds
 Hewitt, William, Alfred Hewitt, and Francis Hewitt, Birmingham, Coach and Saddlers' Ironmongers. July 26 at 2 at offices of Wright and Marshall, Townhall chambers, New st, Birmingham
 Hicks, Valentine, Wivenhoe, Essex, Grocer. July 26 at 12 at offices of Price, Head st, Colchester
 Hill, Henry Hutchinson, Bridport, Dorset, Tailor. July 30 at 11 at 11 at offices of Cox and Palmer, Railway approach, London Bridge. Loggin and Nante
 Hill, William Alfred, Liverpool, Manufacturing Chemist. July 29 at 11 at the Clarendon Rooms, South John st, Liverpool. Quiggin, Liverpool
 Hull, Simeon, Leyton rd, Stratford, Grocer. July 25 at 2 at 19, Worship st, Finsbury. Fenton, Higgate
 Hulce, John, Dawley, Salop, Grocer. July 30 at 11 at offices of Leake, High st, Shifnal
 Hyams, Michael, Alderney rd, Mile End, Optician. Aug 7 at 2 at offices of Jennings, Leadenhall st
 James, William, and James Davies, Abercrombie, Mon, Ironfounders. Aug 2 at 12 at offices of Lloyd, Bank chambers, Newport
 Jenkins, Evan, Gurnos, Yatalyfa, Glamorgan, Grocer. July 25 at 1 at offices of Leyson, Bridge st, Neath
 Johnson, Thomas, Ardwick, Manchester, Tobacconist. July 30 at 3 at offices of McEwen, Lloyd st, Manchester
 Jones, Owen, Portmadoc, Carnarvon, Draper. July 29 at 1 at the Commercial Hotel, Portmadoc. Breese and Co, Portmadoc
 Kirby, Robert, Darlington, Builder. July 25 at 3 at offices of Wilkes, Northgate, Darlington
 Laurens, Abraham, Duke's Dock, Liverpool, Ship Builder. July 30 at 3 at offices of Quinn, South John st, Liverpool
 Leach, John, Bury, Lancashire, Paper Hanger. July 31 at 11 at offices of Whitehead and Co, Bolton st, Bury
 Leigh, Peter, Elton, nr Bury, Lancashire, Seedsman. July 29 at 3 at offices of Anderton, Garden st, Bury
 Lewis, Thomas, New Tradeagar, Mon, Innkeeper. July 27 at 1 at offices of Beddoe, Victoria st, Merthyr Tydfil
 Little, John, Bradford, Beerseller. July 31 at 11 at offices of Peel and Gaunt, Chapel lane, Bradford
 Lutz, John, Hastings, Nurseryman. July 27 at 12 at offices of Langham, Robertson st, Hastings
 Lutton, Edward, Hambrook, Gloucester, Farmer. July 29 at 12 at offices of Benson, Broad st, Bristol
 Macbeth, John, Sunderland, House Builder. July 29 at 11 at offices of Edington, High at west, Sunderland. Robinson, West Sunnisdale, Sunderland
 Mallin, Edward James, Dudley Port, Stafford, Licensed Victualler. Aug 1 at 3 at the Saracen's Head Hotel, Stone st, Dudley. Tinsley, Dudley
 Martinide, Edward Duncan, Salisbury, Fancy Goods Dealer. July 20 at 11 at offices of Syper and Son, Winchester House, Old Broad st, in lieu of the place originally named
 Meyers, Charles, Swansea, Grocer. July 24 at 11 at offices of Thomas, York place, Swansea
 Milne, William Gray, Tow Law, Durham, Draper. July 25 at 11 at the Home Trade Association Rooms, York st, Manchester. Stanford, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Mitchell, Frederick, Linslade, Bucks, Horse Broker. July 26 at 11.30 at the Unicorn Hotel, Leighton Buzzard. Shepherd and Ewen, Luton
 Nairn, Alexander, Liverpool, Draper. July 31 at 2 at offices of Quinn and Sons, Lord st, Liverpool
 Oakes, Ralph, Sandbach, Cheshire, Grocer. Aug 1 at 10.30 at offices of Pounton, Market st, Crewe
 Page, Josiah, Banbury, Oxford, Upholsterer. July 27 at 11 at offices of Crosby, Bridge st, Banbury
 Perkin, John, Longton, Stafford, Grocer. July 25 at 11 at the Swan Hotel, Longton

Pickard, James, Plymouth, Retired Major-General Royal Marine Light Infantry. July 26 at 11 at offices of Elworthy and Co, Courtenay st, Plymouth.
 Pilkington, Henry, Church, Lancashire, Joiner. July 30 at 3 at offices of Holland, Northgate, Blackburn.
 Postgate, Richard, Brecon, Middleborough, Wood and Stone Carver. July 24 at 3 at offices of Hope, Zealand rd, Middleborough.
 Pender, Thomas, and John Knowlson, Hartlepool, Durham, Plumbers. July 30 at 3 at offices of Bell, Church st, West Hartlepool.
 Powney, James, Birmingham, General Dealer. July 26 at 12 at offices of Hawkes and Weekes, Temple st, Birmingham.
 Prince, Samuel, Liverpool, Grocer. July 30 at 2 at offices of Lumb, Moorfields, Dale st, Liverpool.
 Richardson, John William, Leeds, Leather Manufacturer. July 29 at 3 at offices of Simpson and Burrell, Albion st, Leeds.
 Richardson, Thomas, Luton, Bedford, Carman. Aug 6 at 3 at offices of Cooper, Chancery lane.
 Rogers, David, Carmarthen, Plumber. July 29 at 10 at offices of White, King st, Carmarthen.
 Russell, Francis Thomas, Hastings, Builder. July 26 at 11 at the Bridge House Hotel, London Bridge. Langham, Hastings.
 Sargent, John, Leamington Priory, Brewer's Agent. July 30 at 3 at offices of Parr, Colmore row, Birmingham.
 Sedgwick, Thomas, Darlington, Coach Builder. Aug 1 at 11 at offices of Stevenson and Meek, Paxfield terrace, Darlington.
 Sharpe, Alfred, Huddersfield, Leather Merchant. July 29 at 3 at offices of Berry, Market place, Huddersfield.
 Spafford, William, Market Deeping, Lincoln, Publican. July 29 at 11 at offices of Law, St Mary's place, Stamford.
 Spradborough, James, Birmingham, out of business. July 26 at 3 at offices of Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham.
 Stepper, John, Abergavenny, Innkeeper. July 31 at 3 at offices of Jones, Frogmore st, Abergavenny.
 Sugden, Arthur, Cleckheaton, York, Mechanic. July 31 at 3 at offices of Carr and Cadman, Cleckheaton.
 Taylor, Henry, Birmingham, Machinist. July 31 at 11 at offices of Parr, Colmore row, Birmingham.
 Walker, George Kiddy, Manchester, Warehouseman. July 30 at 3 at offices of Addeleshaw and Warburton, Norfolk st, Manchester.
 Ward, Charles George Pariby, East Stonehouse, Devon, Lieut Royal Marine Light Infantry. July 27 at 11 at offices of Rhodes, Church court, Clement's lane, Curteis, East Stonehouse.
 Ward, Joseph, Birmingham, Pearl Button Manufacturer. July 29 at 11 at offices of Peet, Colmore row, Birmingham.
 Wheeler, Henry Samuel, Horselydown, Borough, Oil and Colour Man. July 31 at 11 at offices of Witdecombe, Jan, Camomile st, Bishopsgate st.
 Whitaker, Samuel Jenkinson, Hardware Dealer, Doncaster. July 31 at 2 at offices of Collinson and Co, Priory place, Doncaster. Burdekin and Co.
 White, Edward William, Castle Foregate, Shrewsbury, Confectioner. July 29 at 11 at offices of Corser and Nevett, Swan hill, Shrewsbury.
 Wilcox, Charles Napoleon, Mann st, Waiworth, Lard Refiner. Aug 1 at 2 at offices of Moss, Gracechurch st.
 Williams, Aaron, Birmingham, Hosier. July 27 at 10 at offices of Duke, Temple row, Birmingham.
 Williams, John, Brynmawr, Brecon, Licensed Victualler. July 29 at 3 at the Griffin Hotel, Brynmawr. Bishop, Brecon.
 Wilson, Michael, West Retford, Nottingham, Agent to a Hop Merchant. July 29 at 11 at offices of Bescohy, Grove st, Retford.
 Wilson, Thomas, Birmingham, Draper. Aug 2 at 3 at offices of Taylor, Colmore row, Birmingham.
 Wolstecroft, Mary, Greenacres Hill, Oldham. July 29 at 3 at offices of Buckley, Church lane, Oldham.
 Wood, William, Cheshire, Stafford, Miner. July 30 at 11 at offices of Welch, Caroline st, Longton.
 Woodcock, William Albert, Sculcoates, Kingston-upon-Hull, Tallow Meller. July 29 at 3 at offices of Pickering, Parliament st, Kingston-upon-Hull. Laverack, Hull.
 Wryd, William, Nottingham, Baker. July 30 at 12 at offices of Clifton, St Peter's chambers, Nottingham.

SCHWEITZER'S COCOATINA,

Anti-Dyspeptic Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.

Guaranteed Pure Soluble Cocoa of the Finest Quality, with the excess of fat extracted.

The Faculty pronounce it "the most nutritious, perfectly digestible beverage for Breakfast, Luncheon, or Supper, and invaluable for Invalids and Children."

Highly commended by the entire Medical Press.

Being without sugar, spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates, keeps better in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoas thickened yet weakened with starch, &c., and is REALITY CHEAPER than such Mixtures.

Made instantaneously with boiling water, a teaspoonful to a Breakfast Cup, costing less than a halfpenny.

COCATINA A LA VANILLE is the most delicate, digestible, cheapest Vanilla Chocolate, and may be taken when richer chocolate is prohibited.

In tin packets at 1s. 6d., 3s., &c., by Chemists and Grocers.

Charities on Special Terms by the Sole Proprietors,
H. SCHWEITZER & CO., 10, Adam-street, London, W.C.

PAINLESS DENTISTRY.

MR. G. H. JONES,

SURGEON DENTIST,

57, GREAT RUSSELL-STREET, LONDON

(Immediately opposite the British Museum),

Has obtained Her Majesty's Royal Letters Patent for his perfectly painless system of adapting

(Prize Medal, London and Paris)

ARTIFICIAL TEETH BY ATMOSPHERIC PRESSURE.

Pamphlet Gratis and Post-free.

THE STANDARD LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY.

ESTABLISHED 1825.—Constituted by Special Acts of Parliament.

ANNUAL REPORT, 1878.

The FIFTY-SECOND ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING of the Company was held at Edinburgh on Tuesday, the 23rd of April, 1878. COLIN J. MACKENZIE, Esq., of Fortrose, in the Chair, when the following results were communicated:—

Amount proposed for assurance during the year 1877 (2,300 proposals)	£1,746,841	2	10
Amount of assurances accepted during the year 1877 (1,872 policies)	1,334,879	8	11
Annual Premiums on New Policies during the year 1877	42,220	1	10
Claims by death during the year 1877, exclusive of bonus additions	413,475	2	7
Amount of assurances accepted during the last five years	6,327,788	10	3
Subsisting assurances at November 15, 1877 (of which £1,457,709 ls. 10d. is re-assured with other offices) ..	18,902,853	12	0
Revenue, upwards of Three Quarters of a Million Sterling per Annum.			

Invested Funds, upwards of Five Millions and a Quarter Sterling. The Report, Tables of Rates, and all further information can be obtained by application at the offices of the Company in London, Edinburgh, and Dublin, or at any of the Agencies which have been established in almost every town of importance throughout the kingdom.

Colonial and Foreign Assurances.—Assurances granted on the lives of persons proceeding abroad. Branch offices and agencies in India and all the British Colonies.

SPENCER O. THOMSON, Manager.

H. JONES WILLIAMS, General Secretary for England.

London—82, King William-street, E.C., and 3, Pall-mall-east, S.W.

Edinburgh—3 and 5, George-street (Head Office).

Dublin—66, Upper Sackville-street.

Manchester—110, King-street.

LAW UNION FIRE AND LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Chief Office—126, Chancery-lane, London, W.C. The Funds in hand and Capital subscribed amount to upwards of £1,500,000 sterling.

Chairman—JAMES CUDDON, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Goldsmith-build ing, Temple.

Deputy-Chairman—C. PEMBERTON, Esq. (Lee & Pemberton), Solicitor 44, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

Every description of Fire and Life Insurance business transacted.

The Directors invite attention to the new form of Life Policy, which is free from all conditions.

The Company advances Money on Mortgage of Life Interest and Reversions, whether absolute or contingent.

Prospectuses, Copies of the Directors' Report, and Annual Balance sheet, and every information, sent post free, on application to

FRANK M'GEDY, Actuary and Secretary.

THE AGRA BANK (LIMITED).

Established in 1833.—Capital, £1,000,000.

HEAD OFFICE—NICHOLAS-LANE, LOMBARD-STREET, LONDON

BRANCHES in Edinburgh, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kurrachee, Agra, Lahore, Shanghai, Hong Kong.

CURRENT ACCOUNTS are kept at the Head Office on the terms customary with London bankers, and interest allowed when the credit balance does not fall below £100.

DEPOSITS received for fixed periods on the following terms, viz.:—At 5 per cent. per annum, subject to 12 months' notice of withdrawal. For shorter periods deposits will be received on terms to be agreed upon.

BILLS issued at the current exchange of the day on any of the Branches of the Bank free of extra charge; and approved bills purchased or sent for collection.

SALES AND PURCHASES effected in British and foreign securities, in East India Stock and loans, and the safe custody of the same undertaken.

Interest drawn and army, navy, and civil pay and pensions realized.

Every other description of banking business and money agency, British and Indian transacted. J. THOMSON, Chairman.

EDE AND SON

ROBE MAKERS



BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench Corporation of London, &c.

SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.

BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSEL'S DITTO.

CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS. &c.

ESTABLISHED 1649.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

SWANSEA HARBOUR TRUST.

Issue of Four and-a-Half per Cent. Debentures for the purposes of Dock Extension at Swansea.

The SWANSEA HARBOUR TRUSTEES are prepared to receive applications for DEBENTURES of ONE HUNDRED POUNDS and upwards at FOUR AND-A-HALF per cent. secured on their EXISTING REVENUE of £58,000 per annum as well as the GUARANTEED RENTS of £10,959 per annum of the GREAT WESTERN and MIDLAND RAILWAY COMPANIES and the CORPORATION of SWANSEA for wharfrage, and the further Revenue to be received from the New Docks as per estimate annexed.

The Trustees are a public body originally appointed by Act of Parliament in 1791 for the improvement of Swansea Harbour. Under various subsequent Acts they have constructed two Docks, affording 314 acres of floating accommodation; a navigable Cut of 11 acres and other tidal works; and nine miles of Railway; and they have also acquired 33 acres of freehold land abutting on the Docks.

The Debenture Interest is set aside in the Bankers' hands month by month and paid every half-year.

FINANCIAL POSITION.

The Revenue of the Trust has risen from £8,025 13s. 5d. in 1851 (previous to the completion of any Dock) to £59,517 11s. 10d. for the financial year ending 30th June last. The surplus over working expenses and interest between those dates has reached the sum of £76,942 2s. 9d., which has been expended on productive works for the benefit of the harbour and bears no interest.

The surplus Revenue for the financial year just closed was £3,232 16s. 10d.

The debenture debt of the Trustees (exclusive of this issue) is £524,242, nearly all of which has been raised locally. Of this the sum of £146,242 is secured on Original Bonds which are a first charge, but are redeemable only at the option of the Trustees, and the balance of £378,000 on Terminals Debentures which, with those now to be created, rank according to the date of issue.

THE NEW WORKS.

To meet the growing requirements of the Port, the Trustees have, by the Swansea Harbour Act, 1874, obtained powers to borrow £500,000 to construct a new Dock of 294 acres water area, immediately adjoining the mineral termini of the Great Western and Midland Railways, and communicating with the London and North-Western Railway by means of the existing railway system of the Port.

ESTIMATED COST.

Extension of West Pier 1,000 feet (already completed) ..	£23,000
Purchase of 120 Acres of Freshland Land ..	52,000
Contractors' Tender to construct Dock and Tidal Basin ..	223,000
Hydraulic Machinery	12,000
Railways	31,400
	£352,400
Parliamentary and Engineering Expenses	20,000
Interest on Capital during construction beyond surplus revenue, estimated	20,000
	40,000
	£392,400

ESTIMATED REVENUE FROM NEW WORKS.

Guaranteed Wharfrage:—	
Great Western Railway Company	£4,800
Midland Railway Company	3,540
Corporation of Swansea	2,619
	£10,959
Wharfrage not yet let, estimated	10,446
Rates on Shipping	14,000
Do. on Goods	9,000
	£44,405

EXPENDITURE.

Interest on Capital	18,000
Working Expenses	10,000
	£28,000

Estimated surplus revenue beyond surplus from present estate £10,405

The Debentures are issued for terms of Five, Seven, or Ten Years, according to the wish of the investor, and Interest is paid Half-yearly by Coupons payable at the Glamorganshire Bank, Swansea, or at Messrs. Barclay, Bevan, Tritton, Twells, & Co., Lombard-street, London, E.C. Applications for Debentures should be made to the above-named bankers or to the undersigned.

The applicant is requested to state his full name, address, and description, and the amount and term of years of the investment.

FRANCIS JAMES,

Clerk and Solicitor to the Swansea Harbour Trustees.

Harbour Office, Swansea, July, 1878.

LIEBIG COMPANY'S EXTRACT OF MEAT.

FINEST MEAT-FLAVOURING STOCK FOR SOUPS, MADE DISHES, AND SAUCES.

LIEBIG COMPANY'S EXTRACT OF MEAT.

CAUTION.—Genuine only with the fac-simile of Baron Liebig's Signature in Blue Ink across Label.

LIEBIG COMPANY'S EXTRACT OF MEAT.

"GUILDFORD ASSIZES."

THE WHITE HART HOTEL GUILDFORD.

UNDER NEW MANAGEMENT.

WALTER COLEBY

BEGS to announce that he has purchased the lease of this old-established FAMILY and COMMERCIAL HOTEL, which he has fitted up and REFURNISHED in a style to meet modern requirements. The Cellar has been stocked with WINES and SPIRITS of the best Vintages and finest qualities, carefully selected and supplied by one of the first London firms, and cannot fail to give satisfaction. Families visiting the neighbourhood will here find the comforts of a home combined with the advantages of a first-class Hotel.

ORDERS BY POST WILL RECEIVE PROMPT ATTENTION.

PARTRIDGE & COOPER.

WHOLESALE AND RETAIL STATIONERS

192, Fleet-street, and 1 & 2, Chancery-lane, London, E.C.

Carriage paid to the Country on Orders exceeding 20s.

DRAFT PAPER, 5s., 6s. 6d., 7s. 6d., 7s. 9d., and 9s. 9d. per ream.

BRIEF PAPER, 15s. 6d., 17s. 6d., and 23s. 6d. per ream.

FOOLSCAP PAPER, 10s. 6d., 12s. 6d., and 18s. 6d. per ream.

CREAM-LAID NOTE, 3s., 4s., and 5s. per ream.

LARGE CREAM-LAID NOTE, 4s. 6d., 6s. 6d., and 8s. per ream.

LARGE BLUE NOTE, 3s. 6d., 4s. 6d., and 6s. 6d. per ream.

ENVELOPES, CREAM OR BLUE, 3s. 9d., 4s. 6d., and 6s. 6d. per 1000.

THE "TEMPLE" ENVELOPE, extra secure, 3s. 6d. per 1000.

FOOLSCAP OFFICIAL ENVELOPES, 1s. 9d. per 100.

PARTRIDGE & COOPER'S VELLUM WOVE CLUB-HOUSE NOTE, 5s. 6d. ream. This incomparable Paper has raised up a host of worthless imitations. Purchasers are particularly requested to observe that each sheet bears the fac-simile water-mark "PARTRIDGE & COOPER'S VELLUM-WOVE CLUB-HOUSE PAPER," without which none is genuine.

INDENTURE SKINS, Printed and Machine-ruled, 2s. 5d. each, 20s. per doz., 135s. per roll.

SECONDS OR FOLLOWERS, Ruled, 2s. 1d. each, 24s. per dozen, 115s. per roll.

RECORDS OR MEMORIALS, 8d. each, 7s. 6d. per dozen.

Ledgers, Day Books, Cash Books, Letter or Minute Books.

An immense stock in various bindings.

The Companies Acts, 1862 & 1867.

Every requisite under the above Acts supplied on the shortest notice

The BOOKS and FORMS kept in stock for immediate use MEMORANDA and ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION speedily printed in the proper form for registration and distribution. SHARE CERTIFICATES, DEBENTURES, &c., engraved and printed. OFFICIAL SEALS designed and executed. No charge for sketches. Companies Fee Stamps Railway Registration Forms.

Solicitors' Account Books.**RICHARD FLINT & CO.**

(Late ASH & FLINT),

Stationers, Printers, Engravers, Registration Agents, &c., 49, Fleet street, London, E.C. (corner of Serjeants'-inn).

Annual and other Returns Stamped and Filed.

LAW COPYING OFFICE.

75, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON, W.C.

NO CHARGE FOR PAPER.

DOCUMENTS COPIED 11d. per folio, Engrossed 2d. per folio.

PLANS COPIED.

LAW and GENERAL PRINTING.

LAW and GENERAL LITHOGRAPHY.

LAW and GENERAL STATIONERY.

PARCHMENT.—Indentures ruled and red lined

for 15, 20, and 30 folios, 24s. dozen; Followers, 22s. dozen.

ACCOUNT BOOKS of Every Description.

DIE SINKING and STAMPING.

COPYING and LEVER PRESSES.

EDWARD TANN,

75, CHANCERY LANE, & 308, HIGH HOLBORN.

Samples forwarded. Estimates given.